DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 470 CG 006 255

AUTHOR DeIulic, Robert S.
TITLE An Analysis of College Freshmen Perceptions of Staff Members Who Functioned as Counselors Compared to Those Who Functioned as Teachers and Counselors.
INSTITUTION Boston Univ., Mass. School of Education.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 142p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *College Freshmen, *Counseling Effectiveness, Counseling Goals, *Counseling Services, Counselor Characteristics, Counselor Evaluation, Counselor Functions, *Counselors, Needs, Student Personnel Services, *Student Personnel Workers, Teachers

ABSTRACT

A total of 289 Boston University College of Basic Studies freshmen were randomly divided into two groups: (1) the Experimental Group in which each student was assigned a counselor who was also his psychology instructor; and (2) the Control Group in which each student was assigned a counselor who was not in a teaching relationship to him. Pre-study equivalence was established for the two groups on the basis of personality characteristics, levels of positive mental health, verbal ability, selected background data, and academic motivation. No differences were found between those students who did and did not see their counselors. Further, for those students who did see their counselors, the findings indicated that both groups perceived the interpersonal responses of their counselors in the same way, and that they brought similar problems to them. The study concludes that the teacher-counselor's role does not limit the number or nature of his counseling contacts. No evidence was produced against having a student counseled by one who also teaches him. (TL)

ED049470

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DISSERTATION

AN ANALYSIS OF COLLEGE FRESHMEN PERCEPTIONS OF STAFF MEMBERS WHO FUNCTIONED AS COUNSELORS COMPARED TO THOSE WHO FUNCTIONED AS TEACHERS AND COUNSELORS

SUBMITTED BY

ROBERT S. DEIULIO

(B.S., BOSTON COLLEGE, 1956)

(ED. M., BOSTON COLLEGE, 1957)

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CG006255

First Reader: _____

Dugald S. Arbuckle
Professor of Education

Second Reader: _____

John V. Gilmore
Professor of Education

Third Reader: _____

Louis P. Aikman
Associate Professor of Education

Fourth Reader: _____

Robert W. Hayes
Professor of Psychology and Guidance

Copyright by

Robert S. DeIulio

1970

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Robert S. DeIulio

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

To O. Bruce Brown, for taking the time to care . . .

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This writer wishes to express special gratitude to: Drs. Dugald S. Arbuckle, John V. Gilmore, Louis P. Aikman, and Robert W. Hayes, my committee members, who gave unselfishly of their time and interest; Dean Horatio La Fauci, Dr. Paul McIntire, and my colleagues in the Psychology and Guidance Department for their sincere support and encouragement; the Research and Evaluation Committee of the College of Basic Studies for their financial assistance; Dr. Charles P. Fogg, for helping with the statistical aspects of this study; Dr. George Bond, who made invaluable suggestions for improving the rhetoric of this dissertation; Mrs. Jackie Swain, for the many kindnesses extended to me over the years; and finally, the students, who participated in this research.

In addition, the writer wishes to thank his parents, for having known the value of education; his wife, Margaret, for her understanding and love; and his son, Christopher, for making the "madness" involved in the writing of this dissertation endurable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	1
	Justification	1
	The Variables	3
	Summary and Overview	4
II.	A REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	5
	The Historical Role of the Teacher in Guidance	5
	The Teacher as a Counselor	8
	The Counselor as a Specialist	10
	Related Issues	14
	The Movement Towards Professionalism	14
	The Perceptions of Others Towards the School Counselor	16
	Teaching Experience as a Pre-requisite for School Counseling	18
	The School Counselor and Other Selected Non-Guidance Functions	19
	Summary	21
III.	METHODS AND PROCEDURES	23
	The Establishment and Maintenance of the Sample	23
	Independent Variables	26
	The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule	27
	The Personal Orientation Inventory	30
	College Student Questionnaires: Part I	34
	College Entrance Examination Board: Scholastic Aptitude Test	35
	The Gilmore Sentence Completion Test	36
	Dependent Variables	38
	Relationship Inventory	38
	Frequency of Contact	43
	Missouri Diagnostic Classification Plan	43
	Academic Achievement	46
	Statistical Analyses	46
	Summary	46
IV.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF THE DATA	49
	Pre-study Comparison of the Experimental and Control Groups by Independent Variables	49
	A Comparison by Group and by Sex of the EPPS and POI	49
	A Comparison by Group of the CEEB:SAT Verbal Score	51
	A Comparison of Background Data	51
	A Comparison of the Levels of Academic Motivation Present in the Experimental and Control Groups	52

Chapter — Page

IV. - Continued

Distribution of the Study Population After the Experiment Became Operational 54
Results 55
Question 1: What Differences in Personality Characteristics Existed Between Those Who Saw Their Counselor at Least Once Compared to Those Who Had No Contact with Him? 55
Question 2: What Differences in Levels of Positive Mental Health Existed Between Those Who Saw Their Counselor at Least Once Compared to Those Who Had No Contact with Him? 58
Question 3: How did the Students in Either Group Who Saw Their Assigned Counselor Differ in Their Perceptions of His Interpersonal Response? 61
Question 4: Did the Frequency and the Nature of the Counseling Contacts Differ Between the Groups? 65
Question 5: Was There a Difference in Academic Achievement for Each Group? 70

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 77

Summary 77
Findings 79
Implications 81
Suggestions for Further Research 82

APPENDICES 83

A Freshman Psychology Student Syllabus 84
B Script Used During Orientation Week for the Introduction of Assigned Counselors 87
C Gilmore Sentence Completion Test 90
D Relationship Inventory (Client Form) 94
E Follow Up Letter for Students Who Were Slow in Returning The Relationship Inventory 99
F Letter Sent Towards the End of the Second Semester Requesting Students to Re-take the Relationship Inventory 101
G Missouri Diagnostic Classification Plan Check List for Counselors 103
H Missouri Diagnostic Classification Plan 105
I Selected Background Data for the Experimental and Control Groups by Sex and the Number of Counseling Contacts . . . 108
J Tables 13 - 29 111

BIBLIOGRAPHY 123

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Counselor Assignment	25
2.	Comparisons Before the Study on EPPS and POI Between Groups and Sexes	50
3.	Simple Analysis of Variance with Means and Standard Deviations Included Comparing the Experimental and Control Groups on the CEEB:SAT Verbal Score	51
4.	A Pre-study Comparison of the Levels of Academic Motivation for the Experimental and Control Groups as Measured by the Gilmore Sentence Completion Test	53
5.	A Comparison of Number of Counseling Contacts with the Levels Academic Motivation as Measured by the Gilmore Sentence Completion Test	53
6.	Distribution of the Experimental and Control Groups by Number of Contacts	54
7.	Distribution of the Experimental and Control Groups by Numbers of Contacts, Sex, Counselor, and Dismissals	55
8.	Univariate and Multivariate F-Ratios for the EPPS by Groups, Sex, Number of Contacts, and Counselor	56
9.	Univariate and Multivariate F-Ratios for the EPPS by Groups and Number of Contacts for Dismissals	57
10.	Univariate and Multivariate F-Ratios for the POI by Groups, Sex, Number of Contacts, and Counselors	59
11.	Multivariate F-Ratios for the POI by Groups and Number of Contacts for Dismissed Students	60
12.	Two Way Analysis of Variance with Means and Standard Deviations Included for the Groups by Trials on the RI	61
13.	Simple Analysis of Variance with Means and Standard Deviations Included Comparing the First RI with the Second RI for the Experimental and Control Groups	112
14.	Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for the RI Subscale Level of Regard by Groups, Sex, and Trials	113
15.	Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for the RI Subscale Empathic Understanding by Groups, Sex, and Trials	114

Table Page

16. Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for the RI Subscale Unconditionality of Regard by Groups, Sex, and Trials 114

17. Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for the RI Subscale Congruence by Groups, Sex and Trials 115

18. Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for the RI Total Score by Groups, Sex, and Trials 115

19. Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for the RI Subscale Level of Regard by Groups, Number of Contacts, and Trials 116

20. Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for the RI Subscale Empathic Understanding by Groups, Number of Contacts, and Trials 117

21. Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for the RI Subscale Unconditionality of Regard by Groups, Number of Contacts, and Trials 117

22. Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for the RI Subscale Congruence by Groups, Number of Contacts, and Trials 118

23. Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for the RI Total Score by Groups, Number of Contacts, and Trials . . 118

24. Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for the RI Subscale Level of Regard by Groups, Counselors, and Trials 119

25. Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for the RI Subscale Empathic Understanding by Groups, Counselors, and Trials 120

26. Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for the RI Subscale Unconditionality of regard by Groups, Counselors, and Trials 120

27. Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for the RI Subscale Congruence by Groups, Counselors, and Trials . . 121

28. Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for the RI Total Score by Groups, Counselors, and Trials 121

29. Two Way Analysis of Variance with Means and Standard Deviations Included for RI by Groups and Trials for Dismissals . . 122

Table

		Page
30.	Frequency Distribution of the Nature of Counseling Contacts for the Experimental and Control Groups	66
31.	Frequency Distribution of the Nature of One Contact, Two Contacts, and Three Contacts	67
32.	Frequency Distribution of the Nature of Counseling Contacts by Sex	68
33.	Frequency Distribution of the Nature of Counseling Contacts by Counselor	69
34.	Frequency Distribution of the Nature of Counseling Contacts by Dismissals	70
35.	Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included by Groups, Sex, and Contacts with GPI as Dependent Variable	71
36.	Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included by Groups, Sex, and Contacts with Psychology Grade as Dependent Variable	72
37.	Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included by Groups, Counselors, and Contacts with GPI as Dependent Variable	73
38.	Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included by Groups, Counselors, and Contacts with Psychology Grade as Dependent Variable	74
39.	Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for Dismissals by Groups and Contacts with GPI as Dependent Variable	75
40.	Four Way Analysis of Variance with Means Included for Dismissals by Groups and Contacts with Psychology Grade as Dependent Variable	75

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The major purpose of this study was to analyze college freshmen perceptions of staff members who functioned as counselors compared to those who functioned as teachers and counselors.

Justification

Reviewing the literature in the field of personnel services, one finds that some theoroticians and practioners subscribe to the philosophy that the teacher-counselor role is a most realistic approach to serving the guidance and counseling needs of students. Glanz,[1] Williamson,[2] Kiernan,[3] and Strang[4] have been among those professional writers who have supported this philosophy; its significant strengths be-

---

[1]Edward C. Glanz, "Emerging Concepts and Patters of Guidance in American Education," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (November, 1961), 259-65.

[2]E. Williamson, "Counselor as Technique," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (October, 1962), 108-111.

[3]Irene R. Kiernan, "The Clinician as a College Teacher," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLII (June, 1964), 970-75.

[4]Ruth M. Strang, The Role of the Teacher in Personnel Work (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1946); Strang, Role of the Teacher in Personnel Work. 2nd ed. revised, 1955; Strang, "The Relation of Guidance to the Teaching of Reading," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIV (April, 1966), 831-36.

ing that it placed the counselor within the framework of academic teachers rather than in the role of administrator and that it stressed guidance as a continuing process rather than as a one shot cure.[5]

Other authorities in the guidance field believe that the counselor is a purist; and, as a result, he should not be placed in contradictory roles within the school. Freud,[6] Rogers,[7] Farwell,[8] Arbuckle,[9] and Isaksen[10] have supported this position. They have stressed that the professional skills required for counseling are not always present in the teacher-counselor and have specified that in such a combination he is ineffective as a counselor.

Thus, these two articulately stated positions are operating within the contemporary philosophy of guidance and counseling. Even though much has been written on this issue, there is a paucity of research relating to it. There is an apparent need to test the relative effectiveness of the organizational patterns discussed. Therefore, it was the

---

[5]Glanz, "Emerging Concepts and Patterns of Guidance," p. 262.

[6]Anna Freud, Psycho-Analysis for Teachers and Parents (New York: Emerson Books, 1935).

[7]Carl R. Rogers, Counseling and Psychotherapy (Cambridge, Mass.: Houghton-Mifflin, 1942), 85-86.

[8]Gail F. Farwell, "Counselor Themselves - an Issue," The School Counselor, X (October, 1962), 27-31.

[9]Dugald S. Arbuckle, Pupil Personnel Services in the Modern School (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 1966).

[10]Henry L. Isaksen, "Emerging Models of Secondary School Counseling as Viewed from the Context of Practice," The School Counselor, XIV May, 1967), 273-80.

purpose of this study to analyze college students' perceptions of staff members who functioned as counselors compared to those who functioned as teachers and counselors.

The Variables

In order to accomplish this analysis two groups of college students were formed, those assigned to a teacher-counselor and those assigned to a counselor who was not in a teaching relationship with them.

To establish the equivalency of the two groups, they were examined and compared on five independent variables: personality characteristics, levels of positive mental health, verbal achievement, selected background data, and levels of academic motivation. In addition, the groups were viewed and questioned further in conjunction with two of the independent variables, personality characteristics and levels of positive mental health. The chief question raised was: What differences on these variables existed between those who saw their counselor at least once compared to those who had no contact with him?

Those students in either group who saw their assigned counselor were compared on the following dependent variables: their perceptions of the interpersonal responses of the counselors, the frequency and the nature of the contacts with them, and their level of academic achievement. The major questions asked were: How did the students in either group who saw their assigned counselor differ in their perceptions of his interpersonal response? Did the frequency and the nature of their contacts differ? Was there a difference in academic achievement between the groups?

Wherever possible all data were examined with reference to total group, frequency of contact with counselor, sex of counselees, individ-

ual counselors, and by dismissed students.

Summary and Overview

The purpose of this chapter has been to present the statement of the problem, a brief justification for the study, and a listing of both the variables employed and the major questions asked.

Chapter II will present a review of the related literature. A description of the instruments used in the study, the data collection processes, and the research procedures employed are presented in Chapter III. Chapter IV deals with the presentation and analyses of the data. The summary, findings, implications and recommendations for further research appear in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The question under investigation in this study is the advisability of having a student counseled by one who also teaches him. A very general rationale for those in favor of and against this position was presented in Chapter I. The purpose of this chapter is to give a more detailed review of the literature related to the problem under study. Three general areas will be examined: the historical role of the teacher in guidance, the concept of the teacher as a counselor, and the position that the counselor is a specialist. Issues related to these areas will also be presented.

The Historical Role of the Teacher in Guidance

Historically, professional writers have accepted the classroom teacher's role in the guidance of students. Among those who stressed this position were Smith,[1] Arbuckle,[2] Wilde,[3] Jones,[4] and Farwell

---

[1]Glenn E. Smith, "The Teacher's Role in Guidance, "National Association of Secondary-School Principals Bulletin, XXVII (February, 1943), 84-88.

[2]Dugald S. Arbuckle, Teacher Counseling (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Press, Inc., 1950).

[3]Charles F. Wilde, "Every Teacher an Advising Specialist," The Clearing House, XXVI (November, 1951), 143-45.

[4]Arthur J. Jones, Principles of Guidance and Pupil Personnel Work. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1951).

and Peters.[5]

However, as the teacher's contributions to the guidance movement were being elaborated, guidance writers like Cottingham and Lipton became suspicious of their effectiveness and summond for sound research directly related to the function of the classroom teacher as a participant in the total guidance activity of the school.[6]

They were supported by Grant, who hypothesized that "a thorough and intimate understanding by the teacher of certain areas of the pupil's life ... will interfere with, rather than facilitate, the primary relationship between teacher and pupil."[7] His comments forcast the philosophical position that the teacher-student relationship was not necessarily a good counseling one.

Ribbeck agreed with Grant's position. However, he stressed that "the teacher need not be a counselor to be an effective guidance agent." He emphasized that "the classroom teacher has the guidance-related responsibility of gaining a better understanding of each student's strong and weak points;" and therefore, "the classroom teacher should play an important part in the total guidance program."[8]

---

[5]Gail F. Farwell and Herman J. Peters, "The Guidance Function of the Classroom Teacher," The Clearing House, XXX (December, 1955), 231-33.

[6]Harold Cottingham and Walter F. Lipton, "The Role of the Teacher and the Instructor in the Guidance Program," Review of Educational Research, XXVII (April, 1957), 192-201.

[7]Claude W. Grant, "The Teacher-Student Relationship Is Not Counseling," Journal of Counseling Psychology, VII (Spring, 1960), 148-49.

[8]James C. Ribbeck, "Don't Forget the Classroom Teacher," The School Counselor, XII (December, 1964), 98-100.

Because of the latter ideological commitment Hutson[9] investigated the counseling functions of home-room teachers and indicated a concern for their lack of guidance training. He proposed that those involved in teacher training prepare their candidates with the essential understandings necessary for the performance of home-room guidance. At the college level, authorities like Morehead and Johnson,[10] Rossmann, [11] Richardson,[12] and Donk and Oetting,[13] demonstrated the similarities between the faculty advisor and the home-room teacher. They researched the role of the former and concluded their studies by stressing his importance in academic and educational guidance.

The above presentation has indicated that many professional writers have accepted the role of the teacher in guidance. However, what did become questionable was the concept that the teacher is a counselor. In essence, the issue being raised is whether or not a teacher could also be an effective counselor.

---

[9]P. W. Hutson, "Foundations of the Curriculum for the Education of Home-room Teachers," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XL (April, 1962), 698-702.

[10]Charles G. Morehead and J. Clyde Johnson, "Some Effects of a Faculty Advising Program," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLIII (October, 1964), 139-44.

[11]Jack E. Rossman, "An Experimental Study of Faculty Advising," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVI (October, 1967), 160-64.

[12]R. C. Richardson, Jr., "Developing Student Personnel Programs in Newly Established Junior Colleges," The Journal of College Student Personnel, VI (September, 1965), 295-99.

[13]Leonard J. Donk and Eugene R. Oetting, "Student-Faculty Relations and the Faculty Advising System," Journal of College Student Personnel, IX (November, 1968), 400-403

The Teacher as a Counselor

As far back as 1943, guidance writers were stressing that junior and senior high school teachers were indeed counselors.[14] During the fifties, Strang,[15] Arbuckle,[16] Gordon,[17] and Foster[18] supported this concept.

Because this point of view continued to be suspected within the guidance circles, Ivey conducted a study investigating the effect of college students being counseled by their teachers compared to those being counseled by someone other than their instructor. There was insufficient evidence "to justify the complete integration or complete separation of teaching and counseling."[19]

However, Privette and Merrill studied the effectiveness of professional counselors teaching a college course, and concluded that "coun-

---

[14]Arthur F. Mamminga, "Junior znd Senior High Teachers Must Be Counselors," The Clearing House, XVII (April, 1943), 477-80.

[15]Ruth M. Strang, The Role of the Teacher in Personnel Work (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953), 241.

[16]Dugald S. Arbuckle, "Can English Teachers Be Counselors?" The English Journal, XLII (April, 1953), 192-93

[17]Ira J. Gordon, The Teacher as a Guidance Worker (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1956).

[18]Charles R. Foster, Guidance for Today's Schools (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1957), 20-21.

[19]Allen E. Ivey, "A study of Two Types of Guidance Staff Organizations and Their Relation to Student Perception and Use of College Guidance Services," (unpublished ED.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1959).

selors can responsibly pursue educational goals in the classroom without losing effectiveness as student personnel workers."[20]

Wrenn noted the absence of a formal approach to personnel services on the British campus, but maintained that counseling was inherent in the student's relationships with his tutor.[21] This phenomenon was further demonstrated by Little and Walker.[22] Their statements supported the premise that in some settings the teacher can be an effective counselor.

Hurlbut,[23] Clare,[24] Cottingham,[25] Ullman,[26] Kiernan, 27

---

[20]Gayle Privette and Charles H. Merrill, "A Humanistic and Experiential Approach to Personal Development," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLV (November, 1966), 267-71..

[21]C. Gilbert Wrenn, "Guidance in Other Countries - A Symposium 'Counseling' in British Universities," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XL November, 1961), 266-70.

[22]Donald Little and Basil S. Walker, "Tutor-Pupil Relationship and Academic Progress," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLVII (December, 1968), 324-28.

[23]Edward V. Hurlbut, "Adult Teachers are Counselors," Adult Leadership, X (March, 1962), 263-64.

[24]Mary Julia Clare, "Teacher-Counselor in the Small High School," Catholic School Journal, (October, 1963), 45-46.

[25]Harold F. Cottingham, "Implementing Two Vital Teacher Functions: Guidance and Instruction," Counselor Education & Supervision, I (Spring, 1962), 166-69.

[26]J. Leonard Ullman, "Opportunities for Counseling in the High School Art Department," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLII (February, 1964), 610-11.

[27]Irene R. Kiernan, "The Clinician as a College Teacher," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLII (June, 1964), 970-75.

Melton,[28] and Strang[29] stressed the impact of the teacher as a counselor and together with the professional writers cited above carried this position into and through the sixties.

From a clinical viewpoint, Stieper and Wiener have postulated that although the psychotherapist's role is a teaching one, it does not interfere with his being an effective counselor.[30]

The above evidence has indicated that some professional guidance writers believed that the teacher can function as a counselor with his students without impairing the relationship. However, during the time period represented in the movement toward accepting the teachers role in guidance and the recognition that a teacher can function as a counselor, a group of professional writers emerged stressing that counseling services belong in the hands of specialists.

The Counselor as a Specialist

McDaniel and Shaftel,[31] and Peters and Farwell[32] were among those of the late fifties who prescribed the specialist role for the school

---

[28]Culbreth Melton, "The Helping Relationship in College Reading Clinics," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLIII (May, 1965), 925-28.

[29]Ruth M. Strang, "The Relation of Guidance to the Teaching of Reading," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLIV (April, 1966), 831-36.

[30]Donald R. Stieper and Daniel N. Wiener, Dimensions of Psychotherapy: An Experimental and Clinical Approach (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965).

[31]Henry B. McDaniel with G. A. Shaftel, Guidance in the Modern School (New York: The Dryden Press, 1956).

[32]Herman J. Peters and Gail F. Farwell, Guidance: A Developmental Approach (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1959).

counselor. Stewart joined forces with them and proclaimed that he did not support "the petty activities so frequently found in surveys of what counselors actually were doing."[33]

Pierson and Grant,[34] Hoyt,[35] and Hollis and Isaacson[36] drew a sharp distinction between counseling and teaching. Peters asked for a pause in the momentum towards professionalization to research the issues involved in viewing the counselor as a specialist.[37]

Patterson wrote against the fusion of teaching and counseling: "Whether the teacher-counselor desires it or not, the student perceives him mainly, if not entirely, as a teacher, and often will not, or cannot, change this perception sufficiently to enter into a true counseling relationship."[38]

Landy demonstrated that the authority issue handicapped the teacher as he tried to function in a guidance role. He believed "it...clear that the counselor, to be effective, must be non-judgmental and

---

[33]C. C. Stewart, "A Bill of Rights for School Counselors," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XXXVII (March, 1959), 502-503.

[34]George A. Pierson and Claude W. Grant, "The Road Ahead for the School Counselor," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XXXVIII (November, 1959), 207-210.

[35]Kenneth B. Hoyt, "What the School Has a Right to Expect of Its Counselors," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XL (October, 1961), 129-32.

[36]Joseph Hollis and Lee Isaacson, "How School Counselors Spend Their Time," The School Counselor, IX (March, 1962), 89-95.

[37]Herman J. Peters, "The School Counselor's Emerging Responsibilities," The School Counselor, IX (May, 1962), 134-39.

[38]C. H. Patterson, Counseling and Guidance in Schools: A First Course (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962), 88-89.

and permissive."[39] Thus, he too supported the position that the role of teacher-counselor is a contradictory one.

The American Personnel and Guidance Association joined forces with this position and proclaimed that the counselor "should not be expected to perform tasks which are inconsistent with his professional role..., or which are inappropriate for the social institution in which he works."[40]

Venn,[41] Escott,[42] Heilfron[43] Dunsmoor[44] and Sorenson[45] articulated a similar call to arms and stressed the uniqueness of the counselor's role.

The research of Dannemaier,[46] and Weeks, Sander and Miller supported the hypothesis that full-time counselors are more effective in

---

[39]Edward Landy, "Who Does What in the Guidance Program?" The School Counselor, X (March, 1963), 118.

[40]American Personnel and Guidance Association, "The Counselor: Professional Preparation and Role; A Statement of Policy," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLII (January, 1964), 537.

[41]Kenneth Venn, "Should We Condemn Current Guidance Practice? A Practictioner's Evaluation," Counselor Education & Supervision, III (Spring, 1964), 158-61.

[42]Stanley B. Escott, "The Counselor-Teacher Relationship," The School Counselor, XI (May, 1964), 215-20.

[43]Marilyn Heilfron, "Changing Students' Perceptions of the Counselor's Role," The School Counselor, XI (May, 1964), 221-25.

[44]C. C. Dunsmoor, "Counselor--or What?" Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLIII (October, 1964), 135-38.

[45]Garth Sorenson, "Pterodactyls, Passenger Pigeons, and Personnel Workers," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLIII (January, 1965), 430-37.

[46]William D. Dannemaier, "A Survey of Effects Arising from Differential Practices in Employment of School Counselors," The School Counselor, XIII (October, 1965), 25-29.

counseling than are half-time counselors.[47] Implied within their comments was the position that the counselor was a purist; and, therefore, he should not devote time to non-guidance functions, such as teaching.

Olde and Cambareri discussed and researched the process of staffing clinical counseling services in the small college and wrote in favor of the full time counselor.[48]

Some writers attempted to push the guidance movement toward further role refinement. Lytton perceived that students often "were satisfied to go to their usual counselor for educational planning, but expressed a preference for a different one for personal problems...." His comments forecast a sharper and even more precise role specialization for the school counselor.[49]

Noble,[50] Arbuckle[51] Taylor[52] Cady,[53]

---

[47]James S. Weeks, Daryl L. Sander and C. Dean Miller, "The Unique Educational Function of the School Counselor," The School Counselor, XIII (March, 1966), 134-35.

[48]S. Gene Odle and John D. Cambareri, "Staffing for Clinical Counseling Services in the Small Colleges," The Journal of College Student Personnel, VII (July, 1966), 235.

[49]Hugh Lytton, "School Counseling - An Outside View," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLVII (September, 1968), 15, 16.

[50]Frank C. Noble, "Why Don't Counselors Counsel?" The School Counselor, XVI (November, 1968), 94-98.

[51]Dugald S. Arbuckle, "A Question of Counselor Function and Responsibility," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLVII (December, 1968), 341-45.

[52]Robert E. Taylor, "How Does the Counselor's Chair Fit?" The School Counselor, XVI (January, 1969), 210-15.

[53]Lillian V. Cady, "Developmental Guidance- One Definition and Rationale," The School Counselor, XVI (January, 1969), 218-22.

Moore and Cramer,[54] Patterson[55] and Dunlop[56] have most recently supported the separation of teaching from counseling.

Thus operating within the contemporary philosophy of guidance and counseling are two articulately stated positions contesting the advisability as opposed to the non-advisability of a student being counseled by one who also teaches him. That there is a need to test the relative effectiveness of this organizational pattern is obvious. Therefore, it was the main purpose of this study to analyze college students' perceptions of staff members who functioned as counselors compared to those who functioned as teacher-counselors.

The findings of this study will have a relationship to other professional issues such as: the movement toward professionalism; the perceptions of others toward the school counselor; the necessity of teaching experience as a prerequisite to school counseling; and the implications each of these issues has to whether or not a school counselor should be involved in other non-guidance functions. These areas will be discussed briefly under the general heading: Related Issues.

Related Issues

The Movement towards Professionalism

Within the past ten years guidance writers have attempted to ar-

---

[54]Gilbert D. Moore and Stanley H. Cramer, "Toward More Effective Use of Counselor Time," The School Counselor, XVI (March, 1969), 260-62.

[55]C. H. Patterson, "The Counselor in the Elementary School," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLVII (June, 1969), 979-86.

[56]Richard S. Dunlop, "Counseling As a Profession: Toward Occupational Maturity," Focus on Guidance, II (September, 1969), 1-12.

ticulate their movement towards professionalization. They have been involved in the processes of choosing and acting; choosing the appropriate roads to professionalism and then attempting to act accordingly. As a result of their thinking the dilemma involved in the teacher-counselor dyad emerged. For example, Hill pointed out in 1964 that in order to insure movement towards professionalization for the school counselor a "...clarification of functions is needed, and that what counselors are now doing does not provide an adequate guide to what they should be doing."[57]

Among those who joined with him in his attempts to define counselor role and responsibility were Lifton,[58] Knapp and Denny,[59] McCully,[60] Stone and Shertzer,[61] Stefflre,[62] Peters,[63] Berdie,[64]

---

[57]George E. Hill, "How to Define the Functions of the School Counselor?" Counselor Education & Supervision, III (Winter, 1964), 57.

[58]Walter F. Lifton, "Current Problems in the School Counselor Movement," Counselor Education & Supervision, I (Fall, 1961), 31.

[59]Dale L. Knapp, and Earl W. Denny, "The Counselor's Responsibility in Role Definition," Personnel & Guidance Journal XL (September, 1961), 48.

[60]C. Harold McCully, "The School Counselor: Strategy for Professionalization," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XL (April, 1962), 688.

[61]Shelley C. Stone and Bruce Shertzer, "The Militant Counselor," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLII (December, 1963), 346.

[62]Buford Stefflre, "What Price Professionalization?" Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLII (March, 1964), 654-59.

[63]Herman J. Peters, "The Nature of the Guidance Function," Counselor Education & Supervision, XI (Spring, 1964), 123.

[64]Ralph F. Berdie, "Student Personnel Work: Definition and Redefinition," Journal of College Student Personnel, VII (May, 1966), 135.

Arbuckle,[65] and Patterson.[66] Implicit and explicit within their writings is the principle that teaching and counseling are separate and distinct from one another; and if one were to do both a self imposed schizophrenic state would emerge. Therefore, the findings of this study have many implications for this aspect of the movement towards professionalism.

The Perceptions of Others Toward the School Counselor

Other writers have stressed that not only must the counselor clarify and define his role but he must also be able to develop good working relationships with others in the school setting. Such relationships are based on the various perceptions of the school counselor held by administrators, teachers, students, parents and counselors themselves.

The literature contains a goodly amount of data describing the varied perceptions of the counselor's role and there is a notable lack of significant agreement.[67] The only major conclusions that can be drawn are that counselors do not project an image to teachers, administrators,

---

[65]Dugald S. Arbuckle, "Current Issues in Counselor Education," Counselor Education & Supervision, VII (Spring, 1968), 251.

[66]Cecil H. Patterson, The Counselor in the School: Selected Readings (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1967), 5.

[67]Bruce Shertzer and Shelley C. Stone, "The School Counselor & His Publics: A Problem in Role Definition," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLI (April, 1963), 687-93; Joseph C. Bentley, "Role Theory in Counseling: A Problem in Definition," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLIV (September, 1965), 11-16; Joseph A. Johnston and Garry R. Walz, "Approaching Counselor Role Through Q-Sort Method," The School Counselor, XV (September, 1967), 39-44; Herman Roemmich, "Counselor Functions in Terms of Behavioral Tasks," The School Counselor, XIV (May, 1967) 312-17; Buford Stefflre and Fred Leafgren, "Value Differences Between Counselors and Administrators," The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, X (Summer, 1962), 226-28; Hugh Donnan and Grady Harlan, "Personality of

parents and students that accurately reflects the professional services they are capable of providing, and the kinds of role functions that counselors perform are related to the perceptions entertained by his various publics.

Counselors & Administrators," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLVII (November, 1968), 228-30; William McDougall and Henry M. Reitan, "The Elementary Counselor as Perceived by Elementary Principals," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLII (December, 1963), 348-54; Bruce Shertzer and Charles T. Lundy, "Administrators' Image of an Elementary School Counselor," The School Counselor, XI (May, 1964), 211-14; Robert W. Filbeck, "Perceptions of Appropriateness of Counselor Behavior: A Comparison of Counselors & Principals," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLIII (May, 1965), 891-96; Thomas J. Sweeney, "The School Counselor as Perceived by School Counselors & Their Principals," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLIV (April, 1966), 845-49; Peter G. Fotiu, "Do Counselors and Principals Agree?" The School Counselor, XIV (May, 1967), 302-303; Lyle D. Schmidt, "Concepts of the Role of Secondary School Counselors," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XL (March, 1962), 602-603; Robert Sheran and Ida Shapiro, "Teacher-Counselor Communications," The School Counselor, XVII (September, 1969), 60-62; Robert L. Gibson, "Teacher Opinions of High School Guidance Programs," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLIV (December, 1965), 416-22; Bobby D. Whetstone, "Personality Differences Between Selected Counselors & Effective Teachers," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLIII (May, 1965), 886-90; Stanley H. Friedland, "Teacher-Counselor Friction: An Analysis," The School Counselor, XVI (March, 1969), 263-67; Bea Amundson, Jr. and Frieda T. Rosenblem, "The Classroom Teacher Perceives the Counselor," The School Counselor, XV (January, 1968), 215-19; Alfred Stiller and Frederick B. Gannon, "Differential Perceptions of Counselor Role: Implications for Program Modification," The School Counselor, XV (January, 1968), 198-202; Elizabeth A. Greenleaf, "How Others See Us," Journal of College Student Personnel, IX (July, 1968), 225-31; Robert L. Gibson, "Pupil Opinions of High School Guidance Programs," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XL (January, 1962), 453-57; William R. Larson and Roger E. Rice, "The Differential Perception of the School Counselor by Deviant and Non-Deviant Students," The School Counselor, XV (September, 1967), 26-31; Maurice R. Smith, "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Counselor Role-Function and Counselee Perception of Help Received," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966), Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII (November, 1966), 1241-A, No. 66-11,590; Philip A. Perrone, Mary L. Weiking, and Elwyn H. Nagel, "The Counseling Functions as Seen by Students, Parents and Teachers," Journal of Counseling Psychology, XII (Summer, 1965), 148-52; Eleanor B. Hanson, Middle-Class Parents Look at the Role and Function of the Counselor," The School Counselor, XVI (November, 1968), 115-19.

There is a need to study various organizational patterns in which a counselor can function, and to measure students' perceptions of them. The present study has relevance to this issue, in that it analyzed college freshmen perceptions of staff members who functioned as counselors compared to those who functioned as teachers and counselors.

Teaching Experience as a Pre-requisite for School Counseling

It has been the prevailing practice during the last ten to fifteen years to recruit school counselors from the teaching ranks. The practice of making teaching a pre-requisite to counseling has been supported by such writers as Hudson,[68] Hoyt,[69] Lloyd,[70] Doi, Hyman and Young[71] and Johnson,[72]

Other guidance authorities like Strowig,[73] Arbuckle,[74] and Nugent,[75]

---

[68]George R. Hudson, "Counselors Need Teaching Experience," Counselor Education & Supervision, I (Fall, 1961), 25.

[69]Kenneth B. Hoyt, "Guidance: A Constellation of Services," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XL (April, 1962), 696.

[70]David O. Lloyd, "Counselor and Counselor Trainer Attitudes Toward Counselor Certification in the United States," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XL (May, 1962), 797.

[71]Edith Doi, Bernard Hyman and Earl Young, "A Survey of Colorado Counselors," Counselor Education & Supervision, II (Fall, 1962), 14.

[72]Victor B. Johnson, "Implications of the Wrenn Report for State Supervision," Counselor Education & Supervision, II (Fall, 1962), 27-34.

[73]R. Wray Strowig, "...And Gladly Teach (That I May Counsel)," Newsletter, Illinois Guidance Personnel Association, (Winter, 1961), 36.

[74]Dugald S. Arbuckle, "The School Counselor--Reality or Illusion," Counselor Education & Supervision, II (Winter, 1963), 61.

[75]Frank A. Nugent, "A Rationale Against Teaching Experience for School Counselors," The School Counselor, XIII (May, 1966), 215.

have noted the lack of evidence to justify such a procedure.

Brown and Peterson have called attention to the fact that the school counseling profession must act soon in resolving this issue for it "finds itself in the awkward position of having a requirement which it cannot defend or attack on any but emotional grounds."[76]

The situation that exists in this area neither enhances the movement towards professionalization, nor clarifies the school counselor's roles and functions for his various publics. The findings of this study may provide some evidence for either side on the issue of the relationship of teaching experience to guidance and counseling.

The School Counselor and Other Selected Non-guidance Functions

In situations where the professionalism of a school counselor is questioned, where his role is unclear, and where a high premium is placed on the teaching experience per se, he is often assigned a myriad of non-guidance tasks, the most signicant of these being part time administration and disciplinary functions.

Some research has been conducted related to the former function, the most notable being that of Reeves and Arbuckle[77] and Goertzen and Strong.[78]

---

[76]Duane Brown and Bettie H. Peterson, "The Teaching Experience Prerequisite for the School Counselor: An Examination," The School Counselor, XVI (September, 1968), 20.

[77]Mary Elizabeth Reeves and Dugald S. Arbuckle, "The 'Counseling' Attitudes of Deans of Women," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLI January, 1963), 438.

[78]Stan M. Goertzen, and Donald J. Strong, "Counseling Practices in the Small Colleges and Universities of the Pacific Northwest: A Twelve-Year Follow-up Study," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XLI (November, 1962), 259.

The studies indicated a weakening in both roles if imbodied within the same person.

Commenting upon these types of joint responsibilities, Lortie maintained that the

> ...double imperative of therapy - the necessity to give priority to client interests and the need to relate to him in a total way - makes it extremely difficult to incorporate the therapeutic relationship into a preexisting hierarchy of authority and formal status. In as much as the therapist must enforce even limited aspects of the organization's special expectations, he cannot be certain to place interests of the client first.[79]

Although Williamson has maintained that "discipline must be infused with counseling"[80] most of the literature and research supports the thesis that school counselors must not be assigned responsibility for discipline.[81]

This conclusion suggests that any joint responsibility held by a counselor may weaken the efficacy of his labor. Thus, the findings of this study may have implications for the issues involved in assigning

---

[79]Dan C. Lortie, "Administrator, Advocate, or Therapist?" Harvard Educational Review, XXXV (Winter, 1965), 14.

[80]E. G. Williamson, "The Fusion of Discipline and Counseling in the Educative Process," Personnel & Guidance Journal, XXXIV (October, 1955), 75.

[81]Merle M. Ohlson, Guidance - An Introduction (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1955), 75-76; Norman Stanley Gilbert, "A Comparison of Students' Perceptions of Counseling Relationships Among Schools in Which Counselor Duties Differ," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1962), Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII (March, 1963), 4257, No. 63-3250; William S. Harrold and Morris L. LeMay, "The Counselor - Disciplinarian in the Junior High," The School Counselor, XV (March, 1968), 282-83; Frank A. Nugent, "A Framework for Appropriate Referrals of Disciplinary Problems to Counselors," The School Counselor, XVI (January, 1969), 199-200.

non-guidance functions to the school counselor, especially those related to teaching.

Summary

This chapter has reviewed the professional literature related to the problem under investigation; namely, the advisability or non-advisability of a student having as a counselor one who also teaches him. Three major areas were examined: the historical role of the teacher in guidance, the concept of the teacher as a counselor, and the position that the counselor is a specialist. The following conclusions can be made.

1. The classroom teacher has played an important role in the guidance and counseling of students.

2. As the profession of school counseling matured, the plea for role specialization emerged.

3. This factor put into suspect a counselor's performance of non-guidance functions, chief among these being teaching.

4. Although much has been written philosophically about the issues involved in the teacher-counselor dyad, there is a paucity of research relating to it.

5. There is need to test the relative effectiveness of the organizational pattern discussed, especially as it relates to student perception of the teacher-counselor combination.

6. In essence, it is necessary to determine which professional, the teacher-counselor or the counselor, can have the most impact on students' lives.

Further issues related to the problem under investigation were also

presented and summarized. These included the movement towards professionalism, the perceptions of others towards the school counselor, the necessity of teaching experience as a prerequisite to school counseling, and the dilemmas inherent in other non-guidance functions, such as administration and discipline.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to examine college freshmen perceptions of staff members who functioned as counselors compared to those who functioned as teachers and counselors. The previous chapter presented a review of the professional literature related to this issue. This chapter contains descriptions of the establishment and maintenance of the sample, the control and criterion measures used in the study, and the statistical analyses employed in interpreting the data.

The Establishment and Maintenance of the Sample

The study was conducted during the 1968-1969 school year at Boston University's College of Basic Studies, which is a two year undergraduate program in general education. The course of study consists of five areas: Science, Social Science, Humanities, Rhetoric, and Psychology and Guidance.

The heart of the program consists of the faculty team, each of which is composed of five members representing the five disciplines listed above. In such a scheme a student remains in the same section and has the same group of instructors for the entire year. This results in close teacher-student and student-student relationships.

The college provides academic training for applicants considered marginal by the other schools and colleges of the university.

Approximately four hundred and eighty freshmen were divided into two groups: the Experimental Group (N=240) in which each student was

assigned to a counselor who was also his psychology instructor; and the Control Group (N=240) in which each student was assigned to a counselor who was not in a teaching relationship with him.

In order to carry out the statistical analyses of the data, those students for whom data was incomplete were dropped from the study. This resulted in a final total of N of 289 students; 152 were in the experimental group and 137 were in the control group. In the reporting of the statistical analyses, these numbers will vary slightly due to the computer's mangling of a card or two.

Initially, students were randomly distributed to the Experimental and Control Groups and were assigned to five professionally competent male counselors, who were members of the Psychology and Guidance Department at the College of Basic Studies. These faculty members taught the same psychology course, the syllabus of which appears in Appendix A. All the counselors had been employed at least five years in the college. Three of them held doctorates; of these one was a Doctor of Philosophy in Clinical Psychology, and two were doctorates in Counseling Psychology. The two remaining participants were enrolled in counselor education doctoral programs. All were experienced teachers and counselors; and all agreed to the following descriptions of their professional roles within this experiment: Teacher was defined as a member of a five man team whose particular responsibility it was to communicate the knowledge of general psychology to his students; Counselor was defined as a trained professional who, via a human relationship, involves himself with the student's process of dealing and coping with vocational, emotional or educational problems; the causes of which may have been in

the latter's lack of information about or understanding of himself, the lack of information about or understanding of his environment, motivational conflicts within himself, conflicts with significant others or a lack of a particular skill; Teacher-Counselor was defined as one who taught and counseled (as defined above) the students he had in class.

The Experimental and Control Groups were composed of students from five teams. Three teams in this study were comprised of four freshmen sections. Two teams were comprised of two freshmen sections. Each section contained approximately thirty students. Alternate student sections for each team were selected such that each counselor was assigned sections for which he was a psychology instructor and counselor and sections for which he was a counselor only. This arrangement is described in the following table.

TABLE I

COUNSELOR ASSIGNMENT

Counselor	Experimental Group	Control Group	Teaching Responsibility
1	Sections 1, 3	Sections 8, 10	Sections 1, 2, 3, 4
2	Section 5	Section 16	Sections 5, 6
3	Sections 7, 9	Sections 12, 14	Sections 7, 8, 9, 10
4	Sections 11, 13	Sections 2, 4	Sections 11, 12, 13, 14
5	Section 15	Section 6	Sections 15, 16

In order to insure that the students involved in this study had an identical introduction to the psychology program, their assigned coun-

selor, and the procedures utilized in scheduling appointments with him, a script, a copy of which appears in Appendix B, was used during the time allotted in orientation week for the introduction of team teachers.

Students in the Control Group were permitted to approach their psychology instructor with concerns relating to the course; such as clarification of content, due dates, and make up work. They were discouraged from seeking counseling from their psychology instructor. If solicited for such services, the instructors agreed to respond: "I appreciate your feelings, but why don't you try to work it out with Doctor (Mister) _____." If the student persisted in his attempts, he was seen by his instructor and dropped from the study (N=22).

Data relating to second semester dismissals were analyzed to determine their unique characteristics within the total study population.

The counselors involved in this study met at least once a month to discuss and alleviate any difficulties and/or misunderstandings resulting from the procedures utilized in this research.

Independent Variables

The independent variables used in this study are defined as follows: personality characteristics referred to the traits measured by the Edwards Personality Preference Schedule; levels of positive mental health referred to the measurement of self-actualization by the Personal Orientation Inventory; background data referred to selected items obtained from the College Student Questionnaires: Part 1; the measure of verbal ability was the College Entrance Examination Board: Scholastic Aptitude Test; and the level of academic motivation referred to the

variables measured by the Gilmore Sentence Completion Test. These independent variables, which are described in fuller detail below, were employed to establish the equivalency of the Experimental and Control Groups before the study became operational. At a later point in the research, these variables, with the exception of verbal ability, were re-examined to determine if differences on them existed between those who saw their counselor at least once compared to those who had no contact with him.

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule,[1] henceforth designated as EPPS, was administered to all students at the College of Basic Studies during the fall orientation period, September, 1968. The EPPS purports to measure fifteen personality traits "which have their origin in a list of manifest needs presented by H. A. Murray and others."[2]

Anastasi has listed the following as an abbreviated description of each of the fifteen EPPS variables:

> Achievement: To do one's best, to accomplish something very difficult or significant.
> Deference: To let others make decisions, to conform to what is expected of one.
> Order: To have regular times and ways for doing things neat and well organized.
> Exhibition: To be the center of attention, to say witty things about personal achievements.
> Autonomy: To be independent of others in making decisions, to avoid responsibilities and obligations.
> Affiliation: To be loyal, to participate in friendly

---

[1]Allen L. Edwards, Manual: Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, (New York: The Psychological Association, 1959).

[2]Ibid., p. 5.

groups, to share or do things with friends.
Intraception: To analyze one's motives and feelings, to observe and understand the feelings of others.
Succorance: To receive help or affection from others, to have others be sympathetic and understanding.
Dominance: To persuade and influence others, to supervise others, to be regarded as a leader.
Abasement: To feel guilty when one has done wrong, to accept blame, to feel timid or inferior.
Nurturance: To help friends or others in trouble, to forgive others, to be generous with others.
Change: To do new and different things, to meet new people, to take up new fads and fashions.
Endurance: To keep at a job until it is finished, to avoid being interrupted while hard at work.
Heterosexuality: To go out with or be in love with one of the opposite sex, to tell or listen to sex jokes.
Aggression: To attack contrary points of view, to become angry, to make fun of others or tell them off.[3]

The EPPS is an inventory consisting of "210 different pairs of forced choice statements, in which items from each of the 15 scales are paired off twice against items from the other 14. In addition, 15 pairs are repeated in identical forms to provide an index of respondent consistency."[4] This results in a 225 item objective type questionnaire.

Edwards has noted that his instrument "...was designed primarily for research and counseling purposes to provide quick and convenient measures of a number of relatively independent normal personality variables."[5]

Each of the instrument's alternative statements has been matched

---

[3] Anne Anastasi, Psychological Testing, (New York: Macmillan Co., 1961), 516-17.

[4] Ibid., p. 517.

[5] Edwards, Manual, p. 5.

for social desirability. This factor makes the EPPS more desirable then other personality measures. The statement's social desirability was determined by the method of successive internal scaling.[6]

Normative data for the EPPS as well as an extensive bibliography dealing with personality assessment have been included in the manual.[7] The college normative sample consisted of 749 college women and 760 college men. Edwards reported that "men have significantly higher means than women on Achievement, Autonomy, Dominance, Heterosexuality, and Agression. Women ... have significantly higher means than men on Deference, Affiliation, Intraception, Succorance, Abasement, Nurturance, and Change."[8]

The reliability of the need scales, using a split-half reliability coefficient, varies from .60 to .84, and the consistency of scores is .78. Even though this was lower than some other inventories, Fiske "attributed it to the fact that social desirability has been reduced as a factor in scores."[9]

The validity data contained in the manual has been restricted to construct validity. In reviewing various studies utilizing the EPPS within the past decade, Radcliffe offered more validity data on the instrument, and he maintained that the EPPS's primary value was

---

[6]Ibid., pp. 22-23.

[7]Ibid., pp. 9-27.

[8]Ibid., p. 10.

[9]Donald W. Fiske, "Review of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule," The Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook, ed. Oscar K. Buros (New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1959), 47.

its potential as a research tool rather than a counseling instrument.[10]

The EPPS has been included in this study for the following reasons:

1. It can be administered to a large group with little or no difficulty.
2. Normative data has been provided utilizing high school graduates with some college training.
3. It is a non-threatening instrument.
4. It was utilized to indicate those aspects of personality that influenced the perception students had of staff members who functioned as counselors compared to those who functioned as teachers and counselors.
5. There is need to examine the influence of personality variables in any organizational investigation.

The Personal Orientation Inventory

The Personal Orientation Inventory,[11] henceforth designated as the POI, was administered to all freshmen at the College of Basic Studies during the fall orientation period, September, 1969. It was used to classify students according to levels of positive mental health. The POI was created to measure "value and behavior seen to be of impor-

---

[10]John A. Radcliffe, "Review of the Edwards Personality Schedule," The Sixth Mental Measurement Yearbook, ed. Oscar K. Buros (New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1965), 195-200.

[11]Everett L. Shostrom, Personal Orientation Inventory, (San Diego, California: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1966).

tance in the development of self-actualization."[12] It is an objective instrument consisting of "150 two-choice comparative value and behavior judgments. The items are scored twice, first for two basic scales of personal orientation, inner directed support (127 items) and time competence (23 items) and second for ten subscales each of which measures a conceptually important element of self actualization."[13]

Shostrom described the time and the support ratio scores as follows.

> The support scale is designed to measure whether an individual's mode of reaction is characteristically "self" oriented or "other" oriented. ... The time scale measures the degree to which the individual lives in the present as contrasted with the past or future. ... Since both of these scales are viewed as being clinically interpretable in relative or proportional terms, the scores for the support and time scales are each presented as ratio scores. ...[14]

The ten subscales for the POI are defined as follows:

> Self-Actualizing Value: Measures affirmation of a primary value of self-actualizing people.
> Existentiality: Measures ability to situationally or existentially react without rigid adherence to principles.
> Feeling Reactivity: Measures sensitivity of responsiveness to one's own needs and feelings.
> Spontaneity: Measures freedom to react spontaneously or to be oneself.
> Self Regard: Measures affirmation of self because of worth or strength.
> Self-Acceptance: Measures affirmation or acceptance of self in spite of weaknesses or deficiencies.
> Nature of Man: Measures degree of the constructive view of the nature of man, masculinity,

---

[12] Ibid., p. 5

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

femininity.
Synergy: Measures ability to be synergistic, to transcend dichotomies.
Acceptance of Aggression: Measures ability to accept one's natural aggressiveness as opposed to defensiveness, denial, and repression of aggression.
Capacity For Intimate Contact: Measures ability to develop contactful intimate relationships with other human beings, unencumbered by expectations and obligations.[15]

Norms were developed on a college population consisting of 2,607 entering freshmen at Western and Midwestern liberal arts colleges. There were 1,514 males and 1,093 females.[16]

The POI "items were based on observed value judgments of clinically troubled patients seen by several therapists over a five year period."[17] The items "were agreed to be related to the research and theoretical formulations of many writers in Humanistic, Existential, or Gestalt Therapy."[18] Maslow's concept of self-actualization, Reisman's system of inner and other directedness, and May's concepts of time orientation were included.

The POI manual reports several studies which have contributed to the validity of the instrument. Obviously, it is quite important that the instrument discriminate between self-actualizing and non-self-actualizing individuals. Among the most significant studies testing the POI's effectiveness is one in which it was administered to two

---

[15] Ibid., p. 6.

[16] Ibid., p. 8.

[17] Ibid., p. 25.

[18] Ibid.

groups: "one of 'relatively self-actualized' and the other of relatively 'non-self-actualized' adults."[19] The subjects were carefully selected. Each one was nominated by practicing certified clinical psychologists who were contacted through societies of clinical psychologists.

N's were 29 and 34 respectively. Statistically significant differences were found at the .05 and .01 confidence level.

Shostrom has reported test-retest reliability coefficients for POI scales based on a sample of 48 undergraduate students. "Reliability coefficients for the major scales of Time Competence and Inner-Direction are .71 and .84 respectively, and coefficients for the subscales range from .55 to .85. In general the correlations obtained in this study are at a level as high as that reported for most personality measures."[20]

The POI was included in this study for the following reasons.

1. It can be administered to a large group with little or no difficulty.
2. It is appropriate for a college age population.
3. It is relatively non-threatening.
4. It was utilized to indicate the effects various levels of self-actualization had upon students' perceptions of staff members who functioned as counselors compared to those who functioned as teachers

---

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid., p. 31.

and counselors.

5. There is need to examine the influence of the self-actualization variable in any study of organizational patterns.

College Student Questionnaires: Part I

The following fifteen items on the College Student Questionnaires: Part I[21] were utilized to obtain background data for the study population: 2, 4, 6, 103, 106B - 108, 111 - 113, 119, 122, 128, 129, and 135. The selected questions ranged from items dealing with the respondent's age and number of siblings to his religious preference and disciplinary relationships with parents. The instrument was administered to all students at the College of Basic Studies during the fall orientation period, September, 1968.

The College Student Questionnaire is an objective instrument developed as a means for gathering a diversity of biographical information about college student bodies.

All items in the questionnaire are straightforward and undisguised. Each question is intended to obtain no more or less information than what is implicit in its wording. Therefore, the manual reports that all the items are regarded as having face validity.[22]

Regarding the instruments reliability, it is assumed that in a research setting there is little reason to suspect that students would

---

[21]Educational Testing Service, College Student Questionnaires: Part I, (Princeton: New Jersey, 1965).

[22]Richard E. Peterson, Technical Manual: College Student Questionnaires, (Princeton: New Jersey), 29.

give inconsistent answers to factual questions and as a result no test-re-test studies of the responses have been made.

The instrument was selected for utilization in this study for the following reasons:

1. It is a quick and efficient means for gathering a diversity of biographical data about a large population.
2. It has been designed for college students.
3. It enabled the researcher to determine the group's equivalence on the selected background data.

College Entrance Examination Board: Scholastic Aptitude Test

The College Entrance Examination Board: Scholastic Aptitude Test, henceforth referred to as the SAT, consists of two sections, verbal and mathematical. The SAT verbal section is comprised of tests of word-opposites, word analogies, paragraph meaning and sentence completion. The SAT mathematical test includes problems involving arithmetic, algebra, and plane geometry. The SAT was designed primarily as an instrument for the prediction of probable success in college courses involving verbal and quantitative materials. Since the instrument is so well known on the academic scene no further consideration will be given to its qualities. Students' High School records were utilized to obtain the CEEB Verbal Score.

The verbal SAT score was used in this study for several reasons:

1. To include a pre-study measure of verbal ability for each student.
2. To present a more descriptive and comprehensive profile of the population being studied.

3. To determine if differences in verbal ability existed between the Experimental and Control Groups.

The Gilmore Sentence Completion Test

The Gilmore Sentence Completion Test,[23] henceforth designated as the GSCT, was administered to all Freshmen at the College of Basic Studies during the fall orientation period, September, 1968. The GSCT, a copy of which appears in Appendix C, is a projective instrument used to differentiate academic achievers from nonachievers. It is a test used to ascertain a student's level of academic motivation. The GSCT is a forty item hand scored instrument developed on the hypothesis that academic achievement is directly associated with the quality of relationship that the student has with his parents and with parental attitudes towards learning.[24] Work done by Sappenfield[25] and Silverberg[26] support its theoretical foundation.

Several studies conducted at Boston University have employed the GSCT. Smith's[27] research involved three hundred and two nursing students

---

[23]John V. Gilmore, Gilmore Sentence Completion Test, (Boston: Massachusetts, 1953).

[24]Gilmore, "A New Venture in the Testing of Motivation," The College Board Review, (November, 1951), 221-6.

[25]Bert R. Sappenfield, Personality Dynamics, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956).

[26]William V. Silverberg, Childhood Experience and Personal Destiny, (New York: Springer Publishing Co., Inc., 1952).

[27]Geraldine E. Smith, "The Relationship Between the Responses on the GSCT, with the 1st Semester Grades of 302 Nursing Students," (unpublished Masters Thesis, Boston University School of Nursing, Boston, Massachusetts, 1956.

at the Boston University School of Nursing. She obtained a .76 correlation between the GSCT and first semester grades. Siniapkin[28] conducted a study with one hundred and fifteen nursing students in three Boston area schools. A correlation of .68 was achieved between the GSCT and first term grades. Using a college freshmen population, Tribou [29] reported a correlation of .75 between first term grades and the GSCT. At the High School level, Lynch[30] obtained a correlation of .63 between grades and the GSCT.

The above data indicates that the GSCT does differentiate the academic achiever from the nonachiever. The instrument was utilized in this study to determine if any differences existed between the experimental and control groups in the level of academic motivations.

Because of the subjectivity and time involved in the scoring of the GSCT this researcher's advisors agreed that only a sample of the population involved be included in this study. Relatively proportionate random samples were drawn from each of the groups. This resulted in the selection of sixty GSCT's from the experimental group and fifty GSCT's from the control group. Lynch's scoring key was used because

---

[28]Serge N. Siniapkin, "A Comparison Between Academic Success and Responses On a Sentence Completion Test," (unpublished Masters Thesis, Boston University School of Education, Boston, Massachusetts, 1958).

[29]Virginia Tribou, "A Study of the G.S.C.T. in Relation to Academic Achievement in a Private Liberal Arts College" (unpublished Masters Thesis, Boston University School of Education, Boston, Massachusetts, 1958).

[30]Margaret A. Lynch, "Use of the Gilmore Sentence Completion Test As a Predictive Instrument in Relation to the Academic Achievement of Certain High School Students," (unpublished Masters Thesis, Boston University School of Education, Boston, Massachusetts, 1960).

the twelfth grade sample upon which it was developed most resembled the population in this study.

Hand scoring from Lynch's key introduced the problem of reliability. In order to reduce the error involved the researcher utilized the services of another rater. Thirty tests were randomly selected from the sample of one hundred and ten. Using Gilmore's general categories of underachiever, average achiever, and high achiever, the raters' classifications agreed twenty-eight out of thirty times. Thus it can be assumed that the scores derived from the sample of GSCT's are highly reliable.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables, which are described in greater detail below, were The Relationship Inventory, used to determine students' perceptions of the counselors' interpersonal responses; the students' frequency of counseling contacts, used to determine if selected differences existed between those students who had no contact compared to those who had at least one session with their counselor, The Missouri Diagnostic Classification Plan, employed to record the counselors' diagnosis of what transpired during the visits of their counselees; and the cumulative grade point index, used to determine if dfferences existed in the groups' levels of academic achievement.

Relationship Inventory

The Relationship Inventory,[31] henceforth referred to as RI, and a

---

[31] G. T. Barrett-Lennard, "Dimensions of Perceived Therapist Responses Related to Therapeutic Change," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1959).

copy of which appears in Appendix D, is the major criterion measure used in this research. It is a questionnaire instrument that measures client perceptions of the degree to which four variables of interpersonal response are present in the counselor: level of regard; empathic understanding; unconditionality of regard, and congruence.

It has been employed in this study to determine students' perceptions of their relationship with staff members who functioned as teachers and counselors compared to those who functioned as counselors only. Each student in the study completed the inventory after his first session with his counselor and again towards the end of the second semester. This was done to ascertain any changes in perception between and within each group. The anonymity of the students involved was respected by using a coding system. Appendix E contains a follow up letter for dilatory students. Appendix F contains the request sent to students asking them to re-take the RI.

The RI contains sixty-four statements regarding the degree to which the counselor is perceived as being acceptant, empathic, and congruent. The counselee responds to each of the items on a six point scale ranging from "strongly true" to "definitely untrue." Four subscores and a total score are yielded.

Barrett-Lennard describes the RI's level of regard variable as follows:

> Regard refers here to the affective aspect of one person's response to another. This may include various qualities and strengths of "positive" and "negative" feeling. Positive feelings include respect, liking, appreciation, affection, and any other relatively adient response. Conversely, negative feelings include dislike, impatience,

> contempt, and in general affectively abient responses. Level of regard is the general tendency (at a given time) of the various affective reactions of one person in relation to another ....[32]

Some of the items pertaining to this variable are: "He feels a true liking for me"; "He cares for me"; "He is friendly and warm with me."

Empathic understanding is defined as the following:

> Degree of empathic understanding is conceived as the extent to which one person is conscious of the immediate awareness of another. Qualitatively, it is an active process of desiring to know the full present and changing awareness of another person, of reaching out to receive his communication and meaning, and of translating his words and signs into experienced meaning that matches at least those aspects of his awareness that are most important to him at the moment. It is an experiencing of the consciousness "behind" another's outward communication, but with continuous awareness that this consciousness is originating and proceeding in the other.
>
> Thus, empathic understanding is concerned with experiencing the process and content of another's awareness in all its aspects. In particular it includes sensing the immediate affective quality and intensity of the other's experience, as well as recognizing its particular context ....[33]

Examples of such items are: "He wants to understand how I see things"; "He realizes what I mean even when I have difficulty in saying it"; "He understands me."

Barrett-Leonard describes the unconditionality of regard variable as follows:

---

[32]Barrett-Lennard, "Dimensions of Therapist Response as Causal Factors in Therapeutic Change," Psychological Monographs, No. 562. 1962, p.4

[33]Ibid., p. 3.

> In contrast with level of regard this concept is specifically concerned with how little or how much variability there is in one person's affective response to another. It is defined as the degree of constancy of regard felt by one person for another who communicates self-experience to the first....[34]

Examples of unconditionality of regard items are: "His feelings towards me doesn't depend on how I feel toward him"; "How much he likes or dislikes me is not altered by anything that I tell him about myself"; "I don't think that anything I say or do really changes the way he feels toward me."

Congruence is defind as follows:

> Abscence of inconsistency between awareness and communication is the theoretical criterion for congruence at this level. If a significant perception is not communicated by a person who is functioning congruently, his overt expression is simply neutral or uninformative with regard to it and does not, for example, imply some contrary perception. In other words, the highly congruent individual is completely honest, direct, and sincere in what he conveys, but he does not feel any compulsion to communicate his perceptions, or any need to withhold them for emotionally self-protective reasons.[35]

Some items reflecting this variable are: "He is comfortable and at ease in our relationship"; "I nearly always feel that what he says expresses exactly what he is feeling and thinking as he says it"; "I have not felt that he tries to hide anything from himself that he feels with me."

The total score is the sum of the four subscores, and it is a global measure of the quality of the relationship. A structural analysis of

---

[34] Ibid., p. 4.

[35] Ibid.

the RI, undertaken by Mills and Zytowski,[36] suggested that it measured one general characteristic instead of four separate independent elements of a relationship. This finding required that only the total score be utilized in drawing conclusions from the data. However, statistics for each subtest will be reported.

Barrett-Lennard's normative data for the RI has been reported in his monograph.[37] The sample used for validating the instrument consisted of forty-two clients at the University of Chicago Counseling Center. Twenty-one different therapists, each having from one to four clients, were involved. Sixty percent of the sample were males.

Split half reliability coefficients for the client form of the four scales vary from .82 to .93.

Barrett-Lennard demonstrated validity in two ways: content validity and construct validity; these procedures are described in his monograph.

In 1966 he and Linda Jewell summarized a variety of studies that have employed the RI.[38] It has been a good measure of the quality of interpersonal relationships in T-groups, in short-term counseling relationships between classroom teachers and pupils, child-parent rela-

---

[36]D. H. Mills and D. G. Zytowski, "Helping Relationship: A Structural Analysis", Journal of Counseling Psychology, XLIV (1965), 193-7

[37]Ibid., p. 8.

[38]G. T. Barrett-Lennard and Linda M. Jewell, "A Selection of Reported studies, Using the Relationship Inventory," (unpublished paper, University of Southern Illinois, May, 1966, mimeographed).

tionships, field instructor-student relationships, and in husband-wife relationships.

Frequency of Contact

In the experimental and control groups a record was kept of the students' frequency of contact with their counselors. This was done in order to facilitate the appropriate comparisons between those who saw their counselor at least once from those who did not; and to compare the perceptions of those in the Experimental Group who saw their counselor from those in the Control Group who saw their counselor.

Counselor contact operated according to the practice of student initiated appointments. Seldom did a counselor ask a student to schedule a meeting. Appointments ranged from a half hour to an hour, depending on the schedules of the counselor and student involved. The staff employed the half-hour and hour interchangeably.

The Missouri Diagnostic Classification Plan

A record was kept of the counselor's diagnosis of what transpired during the visits of his counselees. The Missouri Diagnostic Classification Plan,[39] henceforth designated as the MDCP, was utilized for this purpose. It was attached to the student's guidance folder and after each session the counselor checked the appropriate areas. A copy of the check list appears in Appendix G.

The nature of the contact was recorded to order to determine if

---

[39]Robert Callis, "Diagnostic Classification As a Research Tool," Journal of Counseling Psychology, XII (Spring, 1965), 238-243.

a difference existed in the kinds of problems students brought to the counselors in the two groups.

The MDCP is a two dimension scheme which indicated both the problem goal and cause dimension. The categories are based upon previous formulations by Williamson and Darley,[40] Borden,[41] Pepinsky,[42] and Berezin.[43] The categories are outlined and briefly defined as follows:

1. Problem Goal Dimension
   a. Vocational (VOC) - Career choice and planning, choice of college major and similar educational planning which would ultimately implement or lead to a career plan.
   b. Emotional (EM) - Personal and social adjustment problems which have a primary affective component. Problems of adjustment to current situations involving emotions, attitudes and feelings.
   c. Educational (ED) - Lack of effective study skills and habits, poor reading ability or lack of information about institutional policies and regulations. Primarily concerned with adjustment to current academic situations rather than planning for the future.
2. Cause Dimension
   a. Lack of information about or understanding of self (LIS) - The emphasis here is on relatively uncomplicated lack of information. The client simply does not know

---

[40] E. G. Williamson and J. G. Darley, Student Personnel Work, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1937).

[41] E. S. Borden, "Diagnosis in Counseling and Psychotherapy," Educational Psychological Measurement, VI (1946) 169-184.

[42] H. G. Pepinsky, "The Selection and Use of Diagnostic Categories in Clinical Counseling," Psychological Monographs, 1948, No. 15.

[43] Annabel G. Berezin, "The Development and Use of a System of Diagnostic Categories in Counseling," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Missouri, 1957).

enough about himself particularly in relation to certain groups.

b. Lack of information about or understand- of the environment (LIE) - This category is similar to LIS above except it refers to the environment rather than self.
c. Motivation conflict within self (CS) - Conflicting and competing activities within self and contradictory attitudes toward self predominate in this category.
d. Conflict with significant others (CO) - Conflict with parents and other authority figures, with roommates, girl friends, or boy friends are in this category.
e. Lack of skill (LS) - Clients who lack the necessary skills to meet the demands of their particular situation whether it be educational, social or vocational, are to be diagnosed LS.

The researcher instructed each counselor in the use of the instrument. A more complete description of the MDCP appears in Appendix H.

In order to insure its effectiveness in this study a realiability check was made on the classification plan. Each of the five freshmen counselors in the study submitted tape recordings of three randomly selected counseling sessions. Five judges listened to the tapes and rated them accordingly using the MDCP. Three of the five judges were full time members of the sophomore Psychology and Guidance staff at the College of Basic Studies, Boston University. Their experience in counseling ranged from five to ten years. Those three judges were highly trained and experienced; one held a doctorate in education, and two were engaged in programs leading to doctorates in education. The remaining two judges were counseling interns at the College and were involved in the final phases of their doctoral studies. They were not as experienced as the other three judges.

The counselors showed agreement in problem-goal dimension in 82 out of 90 cases. The causal dimension showed agreement in 69 out of 90 cases. Thus the MDCP's reliability for use in this study was demonstrated.

Academic Achievement

The grade point indeces of students in the Experimental and Control Groups were examined in order to determine if a difference existed in the levels of achievement attained. The Psychology grade was examined separately and compared for both groups to determine if the grading of the teacher-counselor effected the perceptions of those students who had a counseling contact with him. Codes of 0 to 9, representing grades F to A, were employed for these analyses.

Statistical Analyses

The questions set forth in Chapter I were answered using frequency distribution, the chi square test of significance, and simple to four way analysis of variance, depending on the nature of the data. The presentation and analyses of the data appear in Chapter 4.

Wherever appropriate, data were examined by total group, frequency of contact, counselor, sex of counselee, and dismissals. The latter group was examined in order to determine its unique characteristics in the study population.

Levels of significance accepted were .05 or above.

Summary

Two hundred and eighty-nine freshmen and five counselors at Boston University's College of Basic Studies participated in this study during

the academic year 1968-1969.

The students were randomly divided into two groups; an Experimental Group, (N=152), in which students were assigned to a counselor who was also their psychology teacher; and a Control Group, (N=137), in which students were assigned to a counselor who was not in a teaching relationship with them.

The following measures which served as independent variables, were administered to the students during their fall orientation period: The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, The Personal Orientation Inventory, The College Student Questionnaires: Part I, and The Gilmore Sentence Completion Test. The twelfth grade College Entrance Examination Board: Scholastic Aptitude Test verbal scores were recorded for all students.

The independent variables provided the researcher with an indication of the study population's personality characteristics, level of positive mental health, verbal ability, background data, and academic motivation.

A major dependent variable in the study was the Relationship Inventory, which measured the perceptions of the degree to which four variables of interpersonal response were present in the counselor. It was completed by each student who saw his assigned counselor. It was employed to determine if differences in perceptions existed between those students who saw an assigned teacher-counselor compared to those students who saw an assigned counselor who was not in a teaching relationship with them.

Other dependent measures included frequency of contact, nature of

contact and academic achievement.

The questions set forth in Chapter I were answered by using the statistical procedures of the Chi square test of significance, frequency distribution, and simple to four way analysis of variance.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to report the results of the findings obtained from the data collected and examined in this study and to discuss the analysis of these data in relation to the questions posed in Chapter I.

As previously noted, a college freshmen population was divided randomly into two groups: the Experimental Group (N=240) in which each student was assigned to a counselor who was also his psychology instructor; and the Control Group (N=240) in which each student was assigned to a counselor who was not in a teaching relationship with him. In order to conduct statistical analyses on a common population, it was decided to drop from the study those students with incomplete data. This resulted in a final total N of 289 students, 152 were in the Experimental Group and 137 were in the Control Group.

Pre-study Comparisons of the Experimental and Control Groups by Independent Variables

To determine the equivalence of the two populations, pre-study comparisons were made of the Experimental and Control Groups' personality characteristics (EPPS), levels of positive mental health (POI), verbal ability (CEEB:SAT Verbal Score), selected background data (College Student Questionnaires: Part I), and levels of academic motivation (GSCT).

A Comparison by Group and by Sex of the EPPS and POI

Table 2 summarizes pre-study comparisons of the Experimental and

Control Groups for the EPPS and POI.

TABLE 2

COMPARISONS BEFORE THE STUDY ON EPPS AND POI
BETWEEN GROUPS AND SEXES

	Between the Groups				Between the Sexes			
Measure	Variable	SF	M1 M2	MF	Variable	SF	M3 M4	MF
EPPS	Intra-ception	9.72**	17 15.4	1.43	Achieve-ment	11.92**	14.4 12.5	7.23**
					Exhibi-tion	7.05**	13.7 14.5	
					Intra-ception	18.78**	15. 17.6	
					Domi-nance	21.79**	14.7 11.9	
					Nurtur-ance	4.59*	14.1 16.5	
					Change	12.61**	15.6 18.1	
					Hetero-sexual	14.93**	18.6 16.6	
POI	Major Scales: Time Ratio	.95						2.42
	Support Ratio					4.53*	2.0 2.3	
	Subscales:	.68			Feeling Reactivity	5.04*	16. 16.5	1.26
					Self Ac-ceptance	3.75*	15.2 15.9	

SF - Step Down F-Ratio
M1 - Mean for Experimental Group
M2 - Mean for Control Group
MF - Multivariate F-Ratio
M3 - Mean for Males
M4 - Mean for Females
* - .05 level of confidence
** - .01 level of confidence

On the basis of the findings reported in Table 2, the personality characteristics and levels of positive mental health were generally the same for both groups at the beginning of the study. Six of the seven sex differences noted for the EPPS support the findings reported in Chapter III; namely, that males are higher than females on the variables of achievement, dominance and heterosexuality; and that females are higher

on the variables intraception, nurturance and change. That females differed on their exhibition, support ratio, feeling reactivity and self-acceptance scores is unique to this study's population.

A Comparison by Groups of the CEEB:SAT Verbal Score

A summary of the groups' CEEB:SAT Verbal scores appears in Table 3. On the basis of the data reported the groups were similar in verbal ability.

TABLE 3

SIMPLE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS INCLUDED COMPARING THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS ON THE CEEB:SAT VERBAL SCORE

Experimental Group (N=152)		Control Group (N=137)	
M	SD	M	SD
505	66	511	64

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Among Groups	1	1895.43	1895.43	0.44
Within Groups	287	1020944.87	4289.68	

M - Mean
SD - Standard Deviation
DF - Degrees of Freedom
F - F-Ratio

A Comparison of Background Data

In a pre-study comparison of the background data items selected from the College Student Questionnaires: Part I, the Experimental and Control Groups appeared quite similar. They were mostly white, eighteen years of age, single and living in the dormitory; they were either the first or second child, and their parents were living together; their

fathers' and mothers' occupations ranged from craftsmen to medical doctors; their economic level was well over $10,000; their religious preferences were spread over the Protestant, Catholic and Jewish faiths; and they came from homes which they perceived as being cooperative and father dominated.

Appendix I contains a more detailed summary of these findings. Responses have been reported by group, sex and contact. A subjective scanning of the table indicates that the Groups were relatively similar in selected background data when examined by sex and the frequency of contact variables.

A Comparison of the Levels of Academic Motivation Present in the Experimental and Control Groups

As noted in Chapter III, the GSCT was scored for a random sample of the study population to determine if any pre-study differences in the level of academic motivation existed between the Experimental and Control Groups. Table 4 contains the results of this scoring. Table 5 contains the results of the scoring when the subjects were grouped by predicted levels of academic achievement and number of counseling contacts. This was done to determine if differences existed after the study became operational.

TABLE 4

A PRE-STUDY COMPARISON OF THE LEVELS OF ACADEMIC MOTIVATION FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS AS MEASURED BY THE GILMORE SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST

	EG (N=60)	CG (N=50)
Predicted Achievement	39	28
Did Not Predict Achievement	21	22

EG - Experimental Group
CG - Control Group

TABLE 5

A COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF COUNSELING CONTACTS WITH THE LEVELS OF ACADEMIC MOTIVATION AS MEASURED BY THE GILMORE SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST

	NC (N=55)	C (N=55)
Predicted Achievement	34	33
Did Not Predict Achievement	21	22

NC - No Contact
C - Contact

In a pre-study comparison, the GSCT predicted academic achievement in sixty-five percent of the sample drawn from the Experimental Group and in fifty-six percent of the sample drawn from the Control Group. When grouped by the frequency of contact variables, academic achievement was predicted for sixty percent of those who saw their counselor at least once and for sixty-one percent of those who did not see their assigned counselor. In terms of the level of academic motivation as measured by the GSCT, the Experimental and Control Groups appeared relatively similar.

The data reported in the above tables have indicated that before this study became operational, the Experimental and Control Groups were relatively similar in personality characteristics, levels of positive mental health, verbal ability, selected background data and levels of academic motivation. Thus, it can be assumed that any future differences noted between and within groups can be attributed to the organizational pattern under study.

Distribution of the Study Population After the Experiment Became Operational

The following two tables contain the distribution of the study population when grouped by the variables: Number of Contacts with Counselor, Contact Distribution by Sex, Contact by Counselor and Group, and Number of Contacts for Dismissed Students.

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS BY NUMBER OF CONTACTS (N=289)

	No Contact	Contact	Total
Experimental Group	81	71	152
Control Group	96	41	137

A Chi Square analysis of the data in Table 6 indicated beyond the .01 confidence level that the Experimental Group had a greater frequency of counseling contacts.

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS BY NUMBER OF CONTACTS, SEX, COUNSELOR, AND DISMISSALS

Variable	Experimental Group (N=152)		Control Group (N=137)	
	No Contact	Contact	No Contact	Contact
Sex: Male	46	38	48	17
Female	35	33	48	24
Counselor: 1	17	24	24	11
2	6	11	14	5
3	26	15	28	5
4	21	11	17	16
5	11	10	13	4
Dismissals (N=35)	8	13	8	6

All analyses of the data reported below were made using the N's contained within Tables 6 and 7.

Results

Several questions relating to the problem under investigation were posed in Chapter I. In answering them, data were examined by groups, number of contacts, sex of counselee, counselor, and dismissed students.

Question 1: What Difference in Personality Characteristics Existed Between Those Who Saw Their Counselor at Least Once Compared to Those Who Had No Contact with Him?

Tables 8 and 9 contain the results of the statistical investigations utilized to answer this question.[1]

---

[1]The statistical program utilized for this investigation was developed by Jeremy D. Finn, Faculty of Educational Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo. A description is contained in R.D. Bock, "Programming Univariate and Multivariate Analysis of Variance," Technometrics, V (1963), 95-117.

TABLE 8

UNIVARIATE AND MULTIVARIATE F-RATIOS FOR THE EPPS BY GROUPS, SEX, NUMBER OF CONTACTS, AND COUNSELOR

	Variables Which Produced a Significant Univariate Step Down F		F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors
Group	Intraception	9.73**	1.44
Sex	Achievement	11.92**	7.23**
	Exhibition	7.05**	
	Intraception	18.78**	
	Dominance	21.79**	
	Nurturance	4.59*	
	Change	12.61**	
	Heterosexuality	14.93**	
Contact	Change	4.85*	.90
Counselor			1.24
Group x Sex	Achievement	5.95**	.64
Sex x Contact	Exhibition	8.86**	1.57
Group x Contact	Exhibition	3.82*	1.57
	Heterosexuality	8.71**	
Group x Sex x Contact	Autonomy	5.86**	1.68
	Affiliation	5.33*	
	Consistency	4.61*	
Group x Counselor			1.33
Counselor x Contact	Achievement	4.21**	.98
	Deference	2.52*	
Group x Counselor x Contact			.84

* - .05 level of confidence
** - .01 level of confidence

TABLE 9

UNIVARIATE AND MULTIVARIATE F-RATIOS FOR THE EPPS BY GROUPS AND NUMBER OF CONTACTS FOR DISMISSALS

	Variables Which Produced a Significant Univariate Step Down F		F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors
Group			1.63
Contacts	Succorance	6.34**	1.27
Group x Contact	Change Endurance	4.27* 8.86**	1.44

* - .05 level of confidence
** - .01 level of confidence

The Multivariate F-ratios reported in Tables 8 and 9 indicated that when the EPPS means were compared and examined in combination with the contact, sex, counselor and dismissal variables, there were no statistically significant differences in personality characteristics between those who saw their counselor at least once compared to those who had no contact with him.

That the EPPS produced a significant F-ratio for the Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors for sex, and significant Univariate Step Down F-ratios for several variables under group and sex have been attributed to a pre-study condition.

When the EPPS variables were examined individually, students who had no contact with their counselor were statistically different at the .05 confidence level on change. A Group by Sex by Contact analysis pro-

duced significant Univariate F-ratios for females with no counseling contacts on affiliation (.05) and consistency (.05), and for males with no counseling contact on autonomy (.01). A Counselor by Contact analysis produced significant Univariate F-ratios for students with counseling contacts on achievement (.01) and deference (.05).

When dismissals were examined apart from the study population, students who had counseling contacts produced a significant Univariate F-ratio at the .01 confidence level on succorance. A Group by Contact analysis produced significant Univariate F-ratios for change (.05) and endurance (.01) for those dismissed students who had no counseling contact.

Thus, in terms of the data reported in Tables 8 and 9, with minor exceptions, there were no statistically significant differences in personality characteristics as measured by the EPPS between those who saw their counselor at least once compared to those who had no contact with him.

Question 2: What Differences in Levels of Positive Mental Health Existed Between Those Who Saw Their Counselor At Least Once Compared to Those Who Had No Contact with Him?

The results of the statistical investigation utilized to answer this question are contained in Tables 10 and 11.

TABLE 10

UNIVARIATE AND MULTIVARIATE F-RATIOS FOR THE POI BY GROUPS, SEX, NUMBER OF CONTACTS, AND COUNSELORS

	Variables Which Produced a Significant Univariate Step Down F			F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors
Group	Major Scales:			.95
	Subscales:			.67
Sex	Major Scales:	Support Ratio	4.53*	2.42
	Subscales:	Feeling Reactivity	5.04*	1.26
		Self Acceptance	3.75*	
Contact	Major Scales:			.65
	Subscales:	Self-regard	6.84**	1.58
		Acceptance of Aggression	3.69*	
Counselor	Major Scales:			.55
	Subscales:			.96
Group x Sex	Major Scales:			.46
	Subscales:			1.05
Group x Contact	Major Scales:			.90
	Subscales:			.92
Sex x Contact	Major Scales:	Time Ratio	3.76*	2.74
	Subscales:			.87
Group x Sex x Contact	Major Scales:			.24
	Subscales:	Feeling Reactivity	4.51*	.56
Group x Counselor	Major Scales:			.84
	Subscales:			.86
Counselor x Contact	Major Scales:			1.51
	Subscales:			.91
Group x Counselor x Contact	Major Scales:			.27
	Subscales:			1.13

* - .05 level of confidence
** - .01 level of confidence

TABLE 11

MULTIVARIATE F-RATIOS FOR THE POI BY GROUPS AND NUMBER OF CONTACTS FOR DISMISSED STUDENTS

Group	Major Scales:	.17
	Subscales:	1.64
Contact	Major Scales:	.30
	Subscales:	1.07
Group x Contact	Major Scales:	.34
	Subscales:	1.17

The Multiple F-ratios reported in Tables 10 and 11 indicated that when the POI means were compared and examined in combination with the contact, sex, counselor and dismissal variables, there were no statistically significant differences in the levels of positive mental health between those who saw their counselor at least once compared to those who had no contact with him.

A few of the POI scales produced significant Univariate Step Down F-ratios. Those indicated for sex have been attributed to a pre-study condition. Students who had no contact with their counselor were statistically different at the .01 confidence level in self-regard. Those who had counseling contacts were statistically different at the .05 confidence level in acceptance of aggression. Males who had no counseling contact were statistically different at the .05 confidence level in their Time Ratio score.

There were no POI variables for dismissals which produced a statistically significant Univariate F-ratio.

Thus, in terms of the data reported in Tables 10 and 11, with minor exceptions, there were no statistically significant differences in levels of positive mental health as measured by the POI between

those who saw their counselor at least once compared to those who had no contact with him.

Question 3: How Did the Students in Either Group Who Saw Their Assigned Counselor Differ in Their Perceptions of His Interpersonal Response?

Tables 12 through 29 summarize the findings of the statistical techniques employed in answering this question.

TABLE 12

TWO WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS INCLUDED FOR THE GROUPS BY TRIALS ON THE RI

Trial	Variable	Experimental Group (N=71) M	SD	Control Group (N=41) M	SD
1	Level of Regard	29.07	9.99	23.56	12.17
	Empathic Understanding	24.06	11.15	18.88	15.45
	Unconditionality of Regard	8.46	13.34	6.34	11.15
	Congruence	26.39	14.71	20.12	16.22
	Total	87.99	41.89	68.66	47.42
2	Level of Regard	25.25	13.66	22.19	16.34
	Empathic Understanding	18.30	15.34	15.85	16.62
	Unconditionality of Regard	5.27	13.66	11.31	14.69
	Congruence	23.35	17.05	18.80	17.99
	Total	72.06	52.33	68.17	56.10

	DF	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F
Level of Regard				
Trial	1	477.44	477.44	6.40*
Groups	1	954.00	954.00	3.60
Subjects	110	29165.62	265.14	3.56
Group x Trial	1	78.00	78.00	1.05
Error	110	8203.06	74.57	
Empathic Understanding				
Trial	1	1268.25	1268.25	18.70**
Groups	1	754.62	754.62	2.12
Subjects	110	39183.19	356.21	5.25*
Group x Trial	1	97.31	97.31	1.43
Error	110	7460.94	67.83	
Unconditionality of Regard				
Trial	1	2.36	2.36	.04
Groups	1	200.32	200.32	.66
Subjects	110	33422.57	303.84	5.23*
Group x Trial	1	868.03	868.03	14.93**
Error	110	6395.10	58.14	

TABLE 12- CONTINUED

Congruence				
Trial	1	325.44	325.44	2.70
Groups	1	1521.25	1521.25	3.57
Subjects	110	46822.19	425.66	3.54
Group x Trial	1	38.69	38.69	0.32
Error	110	13241.87	120.38	
Total				
Trial	1	5914.00	5914.00	7.30**
Groups	1	7003.00	7003.00	1.71
Subjects	110	451200.00	4101.81	5.06*
Group x Trial	1	3099.00	3099.00	3.83
Error	110	89090.00	809.91	

Trial 1 - First RI
Trial 2 - Second RI
M - Mean
SD - Standard Deviation
DF - Degrees of freedom
F - F-ratio
* - .05 level of confidence
** - .01 level of confidence

As seen by Table 12, when a Group by Trial Analysis on the RI was undertaken for the Experimental and Control Groups, there were no statistically significant differences between them in Total score. A statistically significant difference at the .01 confidence level was noted on the subscale, unconditionality of regard. However, as previously indicated in Chapter III, subscales must be interpreted with caution, since there is evidence that the RI does not measure four independent characteristics of interpersonal relationships but one general characteristic.

Tables 13-29 are contained in Appendix J.

Table 13 indicates that when a Simple Analysis of Variance was made comparing the first RI with the second RI, there was a statistically significant difference at the .01 level of confidence for the Experimental Group's Total score. It was in a downward direction. The Control Group's mean for the Total score remained the same. However, the second mean for the Experimental Group did not go below that of the Control Group's mean. Thus, even though the Experimental Group's perceptions of the counselor's interpersonal response changed between the first and second RI, the mean never went below that of the Control Group.

Tables 14 through 18 summarize the data derived from a Group by Sex by Trial analysis of the RI scales. There was no statistically significant difference in the Total score. Thus, there were no differences over time in the way in which males and females perceived their counselor's interpersonal response.

Tables 19 through 23 summarize the data derived from a Group by Number of Contacts by Trial analysis of the RI scales. There was no statistically significant differences in the Total score. Therefore, the number of contacts a subject had did not effect his perceptions of the counselor's interpersonal response over time.

Tables 24 through 28 summarize the data derived from a Group by Counselor by Trial analysis of the RI scales. There was no statistically significant difference in the Total score. Therefore, students' perceptions of the counselors' interpersonal responses were similar for both groups over time.

Table 29 summarizes the data derived from a Group by Trial analysis of the RI scales for dismissals. There was no statistically significant difference in the Total score between the first and second RI.

The Total scores reported in Tables 12 through 29 have indicated that there were no statistically significant differences over time in the way in which the Experimental and Control Group members perceived their counselors' interpersonal responses. Data were examined by group, sex, number of counseling contacts, counselor, and dismissals.

Question 4: Did the Frequency and the Nature of the Counseling Contacts Differ Between the Groups?

As previously noted in the discussion pertaining to the population distribution after the study became operational, the Experimental Group had a greater frequency of counseling contacts than the Control Group. This was statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

Tables 30 through 34 summarize the data related to the nature of the counseling contacts. Data were examined by groups, number of contacts, sex, counselor, and dismissals. Appendix H contains the explanation for the Problem-Cause abbreviations.

TABLE 30

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE NATURE OF COUNSELING CONTACTS FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Problem - Cause		Experimental Group (N=71) Frequency	Percent	Control Group (N=41) Frequency	Percent
VOC	LIS			1	2.44
	LIE	4	5.63	6	14.63
	CS	1	1.41	2	4.88
	CO				
	LS				
EM	LIS	2	2.82		
	LIE	2	2.82		
	CS	30	42.25	11	26.83
	CO	7	9.86	4	9.76
	LS				
ED	LIS	1	1.41	3	7.32
	LIE	14	19.72	9	21.95
	CS	2	2.82	1	2.44
	CO	2	2.82	1	2.44
	LS	6	8.45	3	7.32

From a subjective scanning of the data reported in Table 30, it can be concluded that the groups were relatively similar in the nature of their counseling contacts. The nature of the major problem areas brought before the counselors in both groups were primarily EM-CS, Emotional (Conflict within Self) and ED-LIE, Educational (Lack of Information about the Environment).

TABLE 31

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE NATURE OF ONE CONTACT, TWO CONTACTS, AND THREE CONTACTS

Contacts	Problem-Cause		Experimental Group (N=35) Frequency	Percent	Control Group (N=20) Frequency	Percent
1	VOC	LIS			1	5.00
		LIE	3	8.57	2	10.00
		CS			1	5.00
		CO				
		LS				
	EM	LIS	2	5.71		
		LIE	2	5.71		
		CS	10	28.57	3	15.00
		CO	4	11.43	2	10.00
		LS				
	ED	LIS			1	5.00
		LIE	7	20.00	6	30.00
		CS	2	5.71	1	5.00
		CO	2	5.71	1	5.00
		LS	3	8.57	2	10.00

		1	EG(N=14)		CG(N=11)		2	EG		CG	
			F	P	F	P		F	P	F	P
1-2	VOC	LIE			3	27.27				2	18.18
	EM	LIS						1	7.14	1	9.09
		CS	8	57.14	3	27.27		8	57.14	4	36.36
		CO	2	14.29	2	18.18				2	18.18
		LS						1	7.14		
	ED	LIS			1	9.09					
		LIE	2	14.29	1	9.09		3	21.43	2	18.18
		LS	2	14.29	1	9.09		1	7.14		

		1	EG(10)		CG(4)		2	EG		CG		3	EG		CG	
			F	P	F	P		F	P	F	P		F	P	F	P
1-3	VOC	LIE			1	25.		2	20.				1	10.		
		CS			1	25.										
	EM	CS	5	50.	2	50.		4	40.	1	25.		4	40.		
		CO	1	10.				2	20.	2	50.		1	10.	1	25.
	ED	LIS													1	25.
		LIE	3	30.				2	20	1	25.		4	40.	2	50.
		LS	1	10.												

EG - Experimental Group
CG - Control Group
F - Frequency
P - Percent

Table 31 has presented data relating to the nature of one to three counseling contacts. It is obvious that the major problem areas were

EM-CS and ED-LIE. Because of the small N's involved, data have not been reported for students with as many as ten counseling contacts; but the trend was maintained. Thus it can be concluded that, over time, both groups present relatively the same major problem areas.

TABLE 32

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE NATURE OF COUNSELING CONTACTS BY SEX

Problem-Cause		Experimental Group Male (N=38) F	P	Female (N=33) F	P	Control Group Male (N=17) F	P	Female (N=24) F	P
VOC	LIS							1	4.17
	LIE	2	5.26	2	6.06	3	17.65	3	12.50
	CS	1	2.63			1	5.88	1	4.17
	CO								
	LS								
EM	LIS			2	6.06				
	LIE			2	6.06				
	CS	17	44.74	13	39.39	5	29.41	6	25.00
	CO	3	7.89	4	12.12			4	16.67
	LS								
ED	LIS	1	2.63			3	17.65		
	LIE	9	23.68	5	15.15	3	17.65	6	25.00
	CS	1	2.63	1	3.03	1	5.88		
	CO			2	6.06			1	4.17
	LS	4	10.53	2	6.06	1	5.88	2	8.33

F - Frequency
P - Percent

It can be concluded from Table 32, that when the nature of the counseling contacts were examined by sex, the major problem areas continued to be the same for the two Groups.

TABLE 33

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE NATURE OF COUNSELING CONTACTS BY COUNSELORS

		Counselor: 1		2		3		4		5	
		EG(24)	CG(11)	EG(11)	CG(5)	EG(15)	CG(5)	EG(11)	CG(16)	EG(10)	CG(4)
Prob.-Cause		F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
VOC	LIS		1								
	LIE				1			3	5	1	
	CS							1	2		
	CO										
	LS										
EM	LIS					2					
	LIE			1							1
	CS	12	3	3	1	7	2	5	5	3	
	CO	2	3			1		1		3	1
	LS										
ED	LIS			1	1				2		
	LIE	4	3	6	2	3	1		1	1	2
	CS	1				1			1		
	CO	1	1			1					
	LS	4					2	1		1	1

EG - Experimental Group
CG - Control Group
F - Frequency

A subjective scanning of the findings reported in Table 33 indidates that even though minor variations occur between counselors, the nature of the major problem areas continued to be EM - CS and ED - LIE. Thus, the counselors are relatively similar in the kinds of problems presented to them by students in the Experimental and Control Groups.

TABLE 34

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE NATURE OF COUNSELING CONTACTS BY DISMISSALS

Problem	Cause	Experimental Group (N=13) Frequency	Percent	Control Group (N=6) Frequency	Percent
VOC	CS	1	7.69		
EM	CS	2	15.38	3	50.
ED	LIS	1	7.69		
	LIE	3	23.08	2	33.33
	CO	2	15.38	1	16.67
	LS	4	30.77		

When the nature of counseling contacts for dismissals were examined, the trend noted above is supported. However, as would be expected, they placed a slightly greater emphasis on their educational problem areas.

The findings reported in Tables 30 through 34 indicated that when examined by group, actual number of contacts, sex, counselor, and dismissals, the Experimental and Control Groups were similar in the nature of their counseling contacts.

Question 5: Was There a Difference in Academic Achievement for Each Group?

As previously described in Chapter III, this question was answered by examining a coded cumulative grade point index and a coded cumulative Psychology grade. Tables 35 through 40 contain the summaries of the statistical analyses.

TABLE 35

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED BY GROUPS, SEX, AND CONTACTS WITH GPI AS DEPENDENT VARIABLE

	Sum of Squares	Mean	N
Experimental Group:			
Males (No Contact)	241.8	2.23	46
Males (Contact)	208.5	2.23	38
Females (No Contact)	161.4	2.10	35
Females (Contact)	157.2	2.14	33
Control Group:			
Males (No Contact	207.0	2.03	48
Males (Contact)	86.7	2.15	17
Females (No Contact)	259.1	2.25	48
Females (Contact)	124.3	2.15	24

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	.04	.04	.14
Sex	1	.00	.00	.00
Contacts	1	.01	.01	.03
Group x Sex	1	.90	.90	2.91
Group x Contacts	1	.00	.00	.01
Sex x Contacts	1	.17	.17	.56
Group x Sex x Contacts	1	.28	.28	.92
Error (Between)	281	86.51	.30	1.00

DF - Degrees of Freedom
F - F-ratio

TABLE 36

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED BY GROUPS, SEX, AND CONTACTS WITH PSYCHOLOGY GRADE AS DEPENDENT VARIABLE

	Sum of Squares	Mean	N
Experimental Group:			
Males (No Contact)	712.0	3.48	46
Males (Contact)	707.0	3.71	38
Females (No Contact)	669.0	4.08	35
Females (Contact)	638.0	4.06	33
Control Group:			
Males (No Contact)	570.0	2.92	48
Males (Contact)	281.0	3.70	17
Females (No Contact)	1184.0	4.62	48
Females (Contact)	567.0	4.20	24

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	.05	.05	.01
Sex	1	40.25	40.25	11.02**
Contacts	1	1.32	1.32	.36
Group x Sex	1	6.22	6.22	1.70
Group x Contacts	1	.09	.09	.02
Sex x Contacts	1	8.69	8.69	2.38
Group x Sex x Contacts	1	3.70	3.70	1.01
Error (Between)	281	1026.36	3.65	1.00

DF - Degrees of freedom
F - F-ratio
** - .01 level of confidence

TABLE 37

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED BY GROUPS, COUNSELORS, AND CONTACTS WITH GPI AS DEPENDENT VARIABLE

		Sum of Squares	Mean	N
Experimental Group (N=152)				
No Contact: Counselor	1	78.3	2.09	17
	2	35.7	2.32	6
	3	145.5	2.32	26
	4	102.5	2.14	21
	5	41.2	1.91	11
Contact: Counselor	1	119.1	2.16	24
	2	64.4	2.34	11
	3	84.5	2.22	15
	4	47.3	1.97	11
	5	55.3	2.30	10
Control Group (N=137)				
No Contact: Counselor	1	105.9	2.06	24
	2	75.0	2.27	14
	3	124.9	2.05	28
	4	81.6	2.13	17
	5	78.6	2.40	13
Contact Counselor	1	59.4	2.27	11
	2	16.4	1.70	5
	3	23.7	2.07	5
	4	93.6	2.33	16
	5	13.0	1.76	4

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	.30	.30	.97
Counselor	4	.44	.11	.36
Contacts	1	.12	.12	.39
Group x Counselor	4	2.64	.66	2.16
Group x Contact	1	.16	.16	.53
Counselor x Contact	4	.75	.18	.62
Group x Counselor x Contact	4	3.24	.81	2.66
Error (Between)	269	82.01	.30	1.00

DF - Degrees of freedom
F - F-ratio

TABLE 38

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED
BY GROUPS, COUNSELORS AND CONTACTS WITH
PSYCHOLOGY GRADE AS DEPENDENT VARIABLE

		Sum of Squares	Mean	N
Experimental Group (N=152)				
No Contact: Counselor	1	220.	3.29	17
	2	159.	4.83	6
	3	481.	3.88	26
	4	412.	4.09	21
	5	109.	2.81	11
Contact: Counselor	1	393.	3.70	24
	2	247.	4.27	11
	3	356.	4.00	15
	4	173.	3.54	11
	5	201.	4.10	10
Control Group (N=137)				
No Contact: Counselor	1	415.	3.45	24
	2	266.	3.85	14
	3	464.	3.71	28
	4	254.	3.29	17
	5	355.	5.00	13
Contact: Counselor	1	261.	4.27	11
	2	66.	3.20	5
	3	99.	3.80	5
	4	339.	4.18	16
	5	58.	3.50	4

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	.04	.04	.01
Counselor	4	.92	.23	.05
Contacts	1	2.31	2.31	.59
Group x Counselor	4	28.58	7.14	1.83
Group x Contact	1	7.50	7.50	1.92
Counselor x Contact	4	8.19	2.04	.52
Group x Counselor x Contact	4	10.08	2.52	.64
Error (Between)	269	1049.36	3.91	1.00

DF - Degrees of freedom
F - F-ratio

TABLE 39

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR DISMISSALS BY GROUPS AND CONTACTS WITH GPI AS DEPENDENT VARIABLE

	Sums of Squares	Mean	N
Experimental Group:			
No Contact	14.8	1.35	8
Contact	25.9	1.37	13
Control Group:			
No Contact	13.8	1.29	8
Contact	9.0	1.21	6

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	.09	.09	1.35
Contacts	1	.00	.00	.13
Group x Contacts	1	.02	.02	.32
Error (Between)	31	2.13	.06	1.00

TABLE 40

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR DISMISSALS BY GROUPS AND CONTACTS WITH PSYCHOLOGY GRADE AS DEPENDENT VARIABLE

	Sums of Squares	Mean	N
Experimental Group:			
No Contact	50.	2.25	8
Contact	69.	1.92	13
Control Group:			
No Conduct	16.	1.25	8
Conduct	18.	1.33	6

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	5.12	5.12	3.84
Contacts	1	.12	.12	.09
Group x Contact	1	.34	.34	.25
Error (Between)	31	41.25	1.33	1.00

DF - Degrees of freedom
F - F-ratio

The data contained in Tables 35 through 40 have indicated that there were no statistically significant differences for the Experimental and Control Groups in their cumulative grade point indeces or Psychology grades when examined by groups, number of contacts, counselor, and dismissals. One minor finding was that, as a group, females attained higher Psychology grades than did males. This was statistically significant at the .01 confidence level. This finding, however, has little to do with the organizational pattern under study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

A review of the professional literature revealed that guidance authorities were divided on the advisability of having students counseled by those who also teach them. Much attention has been focused on the philosophical implications of the teacher-counselor dyad, but little attention has been given to student perception of this combination. Therefore, the major purpose of this study was to analyze college freshmen perceptions of staff members who functioned as counselors compared to those who functioned as teacher-counselors.

The study was conducted during the 1968-1969 school year at Boston University's College of Basic Studies. 480 freshmen were divided randomly into two groups: the Experimental Group in which each student was assigned to a counselor who was also his psychology instructor; and the Control Group, in which each student was assigned to a counselor who was not in a teaching relationship with him. In order to conduct statistical analyses on a common population, students for whom data were incomplete were dropped from the study. This resulted in a final total N of 289 students; 152 were in the Experimental Group and 137 were in the Control Group. 112 of these students had counseling contacts; 71 were in the Experimental Group, and 41 were in the Control Group.

Initially, the students were assigned to five professionally competent male counselors, who were members of the Psychology and Guidance Department at the College of Basic Studies. They were trained counselors and educators and taught the same introductory course in Psychology to all students enrolled in the college.

To establish the pre-study equivalence of the Experimental and Control Groups, they were examined on five independent variables: personality characteristics (The Edwards Personality Preference Schedule), levels of positive mental health (Personal Orientation Inventory), verbal ability (College Entrance Examination Board: Scholastic Aptitude Test - Verbal Score), selected background data (College Student Questionnaires: Part I), and levels of academic motivation (Gilmore Sentence Completion Test).

Those students in either group who saw their assigned counselor were compared on the following dependent variables: their perceptions of the interpersonal responses of the counselors (Relationship Inventory), the frequency and the nature of the contacts with them (Missouri Diagnostic Classification Plan), and their level of academic achievement (Grade Point Index).

A student completed the RI after his first session with his counselor and again towards the end of the second semester. This was done to measure any changes in perception between and within the groups.

Five major questions were posed:

1. What differences in personality characteristics existed between those who saw their counselor at least once compared to those who had no contact with him?

2. What differences in levels of positive mental health existed between those who saw their counselor at least once compared to those who had no contact with him?

3. How did the students in either group who saw their assigned counselor differ in their perceptions of his interpersonal response?

4. Did the frequency and the nature of the counseling contacts differ between the groups?

5. Was there a difference in academic achievement for each group?

In answering these questions, data were examined by group, frequency of contact, sex, counselor and dismissals.

The statistical procedures of frequency distribution, the chi square test of significance, and simple to four way analysis of variance were employed wherever appropriate.

Findings

1. There were no statistically significant differences in personality characteristics as measured by the EPPS between those who saw their counselors at least once compared to those who had no contact with him.

2. There were no statistically significant differences in the levels of positive mental health as measured by the POI between those who saw their counselor at least once compared to those who had no contact with him.

3. When a Group by Trial analysis on the RI was undertaken for the Experimental and Control Groups, there was no statistically significant differences between them in Total score. A statistically signi-

ficant difference at the .01 confidence level was noted on the subscale, unconditionality of regard. However, subscales must be interpreted with caution, since there is evidence that the RI does not measure independent characteristics of interpersonal relationships but one general characteristic.

When a Simple Analysis of Variance was made comparing the first RI with the second RI, there was a statistically significant difference at the .01 level of confidence for the Experimental Group's Total score. It was in a downward direction. The Control Group's mean for the Total score remained the same. However, the second mean for the Experimental Group did not drop below that of the Control Group's mean. Thus, even though the Experimental Group's perceptions of the counselors' interpersonal response changed between the first and second RI, the mean never went below that of the Control Group.

When the RI was examined by group, sex, number of counseling contacts, counselors, and dismissals, there were no statistically significant differences over time in the way in which the Experimental and Control Group members perceived their counselors' interpersonal responses.

4. It was statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence that the Experimental Group had a greater frequency of counseling contacts than the Control Group.

When examined by sex, number of contacts, counselor, and dismissals, the Experimental and Control Groups were similar in the nature of their counseling contacts. Their two major problem areas were Emotional (Motivational Conflict within Self) and Educational (Lack of

Information about the Environment).

5. There were no statistically significant differences for the Experimental and Control Groups in their Cumulative Grade Point Indeces or Psychology grades when examined by group, sex, number of counseling contacts, counselor, and dismissals.

Implications

The findings of this study indicated that a sample of college freshmen perceived the interpersonal responses of the person who was s teacher-counselor in the same way as the one who was a counselor only. Initially, the teacher-counselor's interpersonal responses were perceived at a higher level than the counselor's. However, over time, the perceptions students held became quite similar. This evidence suggested that the teacher-counselor role as perceived by students can be as salutary as the counselor only one.

There was further evidence supporting the teacher-counselor combination in that he had a greater frequency of counseling contacts than did the pure counselor. Also the problems that students brought to both the counselor and the teacher-counselor were similar in nature. This would seem to indicate that in no way did the teacher-counselor's role interfere with the number and nature of his counseling contacts. It appeared that the teacher-counselor did not inhibit discussion of emotional problems. His joint responsibility did not seem to weaken the efficacy of his labors. In terms of contact hours, the teacher-counselor had the potential for greater impact in students' lives.

Grading did not seem to affect students' perceptions of their counselor's interpersonal responses. The total Cumulative Grade Point

Indeces and Psychology grades were the same for both groups when examined by sex and number of counseling contacts.

Therefore, no evidence was produced in this study against having a student counseled by one who also teaches him.

However, the findings and implications of this study must be limited to the freshmen class of 1968-1969 at Boston University's College of Basic Studies. The program was highly unique in that it encouraged close student-teacher and student-student relationships. Furthermore, the five counselors involved in this study were trained both as teachers and as counselors. These conditions could have been major factors in contributing to the teacher-counselor's apparent effectiveness.

Suggestions for Further Research

The following suggestions for further research are offered on the basis of the analyses of the data of this study.

1. This study should be replicated using other college student populations.
2. A similar study should be conducted to develop a more sensitive criterion measure of interpersonal relationships.
3. A similar study should be conducted in a less student centered environment using non-psychologically oriented faculty members.
4. A study needs to be done from the teacher-counselor's viewpoint to determine his reactions to the counseling of students other than his own.
5. Similar studies should be conducted at the elementary, junior high, and senior high school levels to test further the organizational pattern under investigation in this study.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

FRESHMAN PSYCHOLOGY STUDENT SYLLABUS

DIVISION OF PSYCHOLOGY AND GUIDANCE
BOSTON UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF BASIC STUDIES

FRESHMAN STUDENT SYLLABUS

PSYCHOLOGY 121-122
1968-1969

SEMESTER I (September 1968 - December 1968)

During the first semester you will be exposed to a number of questions designed to arouse your interest in the following areas:

1. Who am I in a program of General Education?
2. How do I perceive my role in this situation?
3. How did I learn or come to possess these perceptions of myself as a learner? How did I acquire my own unique perceptions as a learner?

The aims of this semester are to provide the individual student with the kinds of learning experiences which will enable him to:

1. Facilitate his learning process in a college setting devoted to general education.

2. Relate himself to models of effective human behavior.

3. Understand the learning processes by which he reaches his perceived position in relation to the models of effective behavior learning.

An attempt will be made during the first semester to investigate these questions. You will meet your Psychology instructor for two hours each week. One hour will be devoted to lecture and/or dialogue on the relevant content of the week in a 511, 505 or Jacob Sleeper Hall setting. The second hour will be devoted to discussion and interaction in a full or half section meeting in rooms assigned on your schedule. Evaluative instruments will be designed and administered by your individual instructor during the first semester. One departmental examination will be held during the period assigned for midterms. The texts for this semester will be assigned by the individual instructors.

Stone & Church, Childhood and Adolescence*
Heath, R.A., The Reasonable Adventurer*
N.A.R.D., Perceiving, Behaving, and Becoming**
Moustakas, C., Creativity and Conformity**
Jourard, S., The Transparent Self**

Other materials in book or pamphlet form may be assigned at the discretion of the individual instructor. It is anticipated that assignments may be made in conjunction with other divisions within the team structure.

---

* These texts are common to all instructors.
** These texts may be used at the discretion of the instructors.

SEMESTER II (January 1969 - May 1969)

The second semester of the Psychology program will attempt to investigate the following questions:

1. What are the sources of individual human development?
   a. As a bio-psychological creature
   b. As a psycho-social creature
   c. As a creature of needs

This semester is concerned with the first 18 years of life. An attempt will be made to examine the following questions:

1. What are the sources of self-perception?
2. Who am I, at this existential point in time, as a result of these processes?
3. What are the commonalities and differentials between human beings?

The second semester will follow a chronological sequence in the search for the sources of understanding of these questions. Reference will be made to content resources more often than in the first semester. The topical outline follows the development of human behavior from conception through adolescence. Although the topics may appear to overlap, each will bear its particular significance to the period under study. The form of presentation will vary according to the individual instructor. (Models of development may be utilized in conjunction or as separate units - Freud, Erickson, White, etc.)

Topics:

1. The biological determinants of behavior
   a. Prenatal influence
   b. Perceptual and physiological channels
   c. Heredity - environment

2. Earliest learning processes in infancy
   a. Classical conditioning
   b. Operant conditioning
   c. Perceptual learning
   d. Hierarchy of learning processes

3. Inherited versus acquired motivation
   a. Familial sources
   b. School, peer sources
   c. Conflict of inner and outer behavior

4. Emergence
   a. Adolescent theories
   b. Conflicting attitudes (internal and external)
   c. Individual differences
   d. The self-concept

During this semester two departmental examinations, a mid semester and a final examination will be given. Fifty (50) percent of the student's grade will be determined by his performance on these evaluations. The remainder of the student's evaluation will be determined at the instructor's discretion. The content resource for this semester will be drawn primarily from the Stone and Church, Childhood and Adolescence, 2nd edition.

APPENDIX B

SCRIPT USED DURING ORIENTATION WEEK FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF ASSIGNED COUNSELORS

In order to have students involved in this study meet their counselors in the same manner, the following script was followed during the time alloted in orientation week for the introduction of team teachers.

Counselor One: The College of Basic Studies offers a four semester program in Psychology and Guidance. The first semester will deal informally with three general questions as they relate to this college setting: Who am I? Where am I going? Do I belong?

The second and third semesters will be devoted to a more formal study of psychology, the focus of which will be the developmental approach to the understanding of human personality. We will follow man from infancy, early childhood, late childhood, adolescence, young adulthood through to maturity.

The fourth semester will stress the individual's specific plans of the following year.

Each of you has been assigned a counselor from the Psychology and Guidance Department. I will be the counselor for section____ and____. Dr. (Mr.) _____, who I shall introduce in a moment, will be the counselor for sections____and____.

Dr. (Mr.) _____.

Counselor Two: Good Morning. (Good Afternoon) As Dr. (Mr.)_____ has indicated, I'll be the counselor for sections____and____. Just as with Dr. (Mr.)_____for sections____and____I am available to help you with any academic, social, or personal problems which may beset you in the course of your Freshman year.

You may schedule an appointment with your counselor through the Psychology and Guidance office in room 215. I am looking forward to meeting and getting to know you.

Counselor One: The Psychology and Guidance Department is constantly trying to improve its service to students. In order to help us meet this goal, at the end of your first session with your counselor you will be asked to fill out a questionnaire regarding your perceptions of him. This form is to be returned to the Psychology and Guidance office. For those who use the services of their counselor, this process will be repeated towards the end of the second semester. The questionnaire will be coded to respect your anonymity.

APPENDIX C

GILMORE SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST

EXPERIMENTAL COPY

Name_____ Date_____

91

GILMORE SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST

In this test you are to finish the sentence from the suggested word or phrase. Make a good complete sentence but do not work too long making it perfect. If the suggested word occurs in the middle of the line, you may place it wherever you wish in your sentence. The test is not timed but it is necessary to keep working in order to finish within the session. Allow about 7 minutes to a page.

1. The best thing that I

2. Fellows

3. Teachers who

4. At home we

5. I do not like to be

6. The most important thing to me

7. I think my future

8. father

9. Quizzes and examinations

10. I am determined

11. The most important influence in my life

12. I want to know

Published by John V. Gilmore, Boston, Massachusetts
Copyright 1953 - John V. Gilmore

13. mother

92

14. What pleased me most

15. I think that life is

16. When I succeed

17. What bothers me most

18. I am happy when

19. I am held back from doing what I want because

20. All my life I

21. When things are against me

22. What keeps me going

23. time

24. If I could only

25. To me people

26. When I think of my future

27. One's parents

28. The main driving force in my life

93

29. I think that girls

30. My family

31. When I am 65

32. I get tired

33. It is impossible

34. pain

35. I am dependent upon

36. If I fail

37. I would like to be

38. I dream of the time

39. I try

40. When I was a child

Acknowledgment is hereby made to the pioneer works of Dr. A.F. Payne, Miss Amanda R. Rhode, Miss Gertrude Hildreth, Dr. Morris I. Stein, Dr. Julian B. Rotter, Mrs. Dorothy King, and others for their contribution to the field of Sentence Completion Testing.

APPENDIX D

RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY (CLIENT FORM)

104

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THIS FORM. It will be coded anonymously and your answers used for research purposes only.

Please return this form to the Psychology and Guidance Office within 24 hours. At that time, the secretaries will credit you with having returned it. Thank you for your cooperation.

RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY*--- FORM OS - M-64

Below are listed a variety of ways that one person may feel or behave in relation to another person.

Please consider each statement with reference to your present relationship with your counselor.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how strongly you feel that it is true, or not true, in this relationship. Please mark every one. Write in + 3, + 2, + 1, or -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers.

+3: Yes, I strongly feel that is is true.

+ 2: Yes, I feel it is true.

+ 1: Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.

-1: No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.

-2: No, I feel it is not true.

-3: No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

____1. He respects me as a person.

____2. He wants to understand how I see things.

____3. His interest in me depends on the things I say cr do.

____4. He is comfortable and at ease in our relationship.

____5. He feels a true liking for me.

____6. He may understand my words but he does not see the way I feel.

____7. Whether I am feeling happy or unhappy with myself makes no real difference to the way he feels about me.

____8. I feel that he puts on a role or front with me.

____9. He is impatient with me.

____10. He nearly always knows exactly what I mean.

____11. Depending on my behavior he has a better opinion of me sometimes than he has at other times.

____12. I feel that he is real and genuine with me.

____13. I feel appreciated by him.

____14. He looks at what I do from his own point of view.

____15. His feeling toward me doesn't depend on how I feel toward him.

____16. It makes him uneasy when I ask or talk about certain things.

*Reproduced with the permission of G.T. Barrett-Lennard.

___17. He is indifferent to me.

___18. He usually senses or realizes what I am feeling.

___19. He wants me to be a particular kind of person.

___20. I nearly always feel that what he says expresses exactly what he is feeling and thinking as he says it.

___21. He finds me rather dull and uninteresting.

___22. His own attitudes toward some of the things I do or say prevent him from understanding me.

___23. I can (or could) be openly critical or appreciative of him without really making him feel any differently about me.

___24. He wants me to think that he likes me or understands me more than he really does.

___25. He cares for me.

___26. Sometimes he thinks that I feel a certain way, because that's the way he feels.

___27. He likes certain things about me, and there are other things he does not like.

___28. He does not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.

___29. I feel that he disapproves of me.

___30. He realizes what I mean even when I have difficulty in saying it.

___31. His attitude toward me stays the same: he is not pleased with me sometimes and critical or disappointed at other times.

___32. Sometimes he is not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.

___33. He just tolerates me.

___34. He usually understands the whole of what I mean.

___35. If I show that I am angry with him he becomes hurt or angry with me, too.

___36. He expresses his true impressions and feelings with me.

___37. He is friendly and warm with me.

___38. He just takes no notice of some things that I think or feel.

___39. How much he likes or dislikes me is not altered by anything that I tell him about myself.

___40. At times I sense that he is not aware of what he is really feeling with me.

___41. I feel that he really values me.

___42. He appreciates exactly how the things I experience feel to me.

___43. He approves of some things I do, and plainly disapproves of others.

___44. He is willing to express whatever is actually in his mind with me, including any feelings about himself or about me.

___45. He doesn't like me for myself

___46. At times he thinks that I feel a lot more strongly about a particular thing than I really do.

___47. Whether I am in good spirits or feeling upset does not make him feel any more or less appreciative of me.

___48. He is openly himself in our relationship.

___49. I seem to irritate and bother him.

___50. He does not realize how sensitive I am about some of the things we discuss.

___51. Whether the ideas and feelings I express are "good" or "bad" seems to make no difference to his feelihg toward me.

___52. There are times when I feel that his outward response to me is quite different from the way he feels underneath.

___53. At times he feels contempt for me.

___54. He understands me.

___55. Sometimes I am more worthwhile in his eyes than I am at other times.

___56. I have not felt that he tries to hide anything from himself that he feels with me.

___57. He is truly interested in me.

___58. His response to me is usually so fixed and automatic that I don't reall; get through to him.

___59. I don't think that anything I say or do really changes the way he feels toward me.

___60. What he says to me often gives a wrong impression of his whole thought or feeling at the time.

___61. He feels deep affection for me.

___62. When I am hurt or upset he can recognize my feelings exactly, without becoming upset himself.

___63. What other people think of me does (or would, if he knew) affect the way he feels toward me.

___64. I believe that he has feelings he does not tell me about that are causing difficulty in our relationship.

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW UP LETTER FOR STUDENTS WHO

WERE SLOW IN RETURNING THE

RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

100

Dear

When you visited your counselor_____, you were asked to complete an anonymous evaluation of counselor-counselee relationship as you experienced it. I realize that such instruments are both highly subjective and onerous to complete; yet we have no better techniques presently available to us for research into this most important work.

We preserve anonymity by not asking for the counselor's name and simply checking your name off when you return your copy. It is the absence of this "check off" that prompts this request. If you have misplaced your copy our staff will be glad to furnish you another. If you can find your copy and complete it and return it to room 215, you will be materially assisting us in our efforts to provide effective counseling for you and those who follow you.

Your prompt response will be most deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Paul H. McIntire
Professor and Chairman
Division of Psychology and Guidance

110

APPENDIX F

LETTER SENT TOWARDS THE END OF THE SECOND SEMESTER REQUESTING STUDENTS TO RE-TAKE THE RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

111

Dear

When you first visited your counselor, you were asked to complete an anonymous evaluation of counselor-counselee relationship as you experienced it. Now that some significant time and experience have intervened since that contact, we wonder if you see him in the same way or if possibly you may see him differently today. This is a most important question to us, for in the answer you give we may learn to be more effective in helping other students who seek our services.

Would you please take the time to think back about your counselor and report to us (again anonymously) how you now see him, by means of the attached copy of the Relationship Inventory.

Our sincerest thanks for your cooperation in assisting us to understand better the quality and nature of our work.

Sincerely,

Paul H. McIntire
Professor and Chairman
Division of Psychology and Guidance

APPENDIX G

MISSOURI DIAGNOSTIC CLASSIFICATION

PLAN CHECK LIST FOR COUNSELORS

Student's Name_____Code Number_____Date_____

The Missouri Diagnostic Classification Plan

Problem-goal Dimension: VOC ____ (Check one)

EM ____

ED ____

Cause Dimension: LIS ____ (Check one)

LIE ____

CS ____

CO ____

LS ____

Length of session _____

(Please return this form to the Psychology and Guidance Office at the end of the day.)

APPENDIX H

MISSOURI DIAGNOSTIC CLASSIFICATION PLAN

This is a two dimension scheme in which both (1) problem-goal and (2) cause is indicated.

Problem Goal Dimension. This dimension is identical to the Williamson-Darley categories except that only three categories were needed to account for all of our cases. Other agencies might find a need for additional categories, and if so, they could be added. The three categories are (1) vocational, (2) emotional, and (3) educational. This specifies not only the type of problem dealt with but also the practical goal of counseling. For example, if the problem is judged to be a vocational one, say choice, of a career by a college freshman, it also specifies the goal to be achieved through counseling, i.e., the choice of an appropriate career by this college freshman.

This dimension refers to the developed problem and not necessarily to the presented one. Also, it is the problem which the counselor and client agree to work on and do so. The definition of the categories of this dimension are as follows:

Vocational (VOC)-Career choice and planning, choice of college major and similar educational planning which would ultimately implement or lead to a career plan.

Emotional (EM)-Personal and social adjustment problems which have a primary affective component, Problems of adjustment to current situations involving emotions, attitudes and feelings.

Educational (ED)- Lack of effective study skills and habits, poor reading ability or lack of information about institutional policies and regulations. Primarily concerned with adjustment to current academic situations rather than planning for future.

Cause dimension. The other dimension of the diagnosis is causal. Perhaps it is a little presumptive to suggest that we know enough to determine cause, however, it is the same thing that others have labeled psychological or dynamic. Categories in this dimension refer to the probable cause of the developed problem and attempt to answer the question, "Why is the client unable to solve his problem within his own personal resources?" or "What is the inadequacy in the client's behavior repertoire?" (Callis, 1960). The definitions of these categories are as follows:

Lack of information about or understanding of self (LIS)- The emphasis here is on relatively uncomplicated lack of information. The client simply does not know enough about himself particularly in relation to certain groups. For example, the client may ask, "Am I bright enough to successfully complete the law curriculum?" He may be sufficiently well versed regarding his intellectual ability in relation to his current educational peers but needs additional understanding of himself with respect to some possible future peer group.

Lack of information about or understanding of the environment (LIE)-This category is similar to LIS above except it refers to the environment rather than self, Occupational and educational stereotypes as well as simple lack of information are included here. LIE may result from lack of experiences,gaps in training, or exposure to incomplete or biased propaganda.

Caution must be used in employing this category because of its high social respectability as a reason for inability to solve a problem. A client who persistently distorts the available information about the environment because of strong status needs should not be diagnosed LIE but probably would be diagnosed LIS or CS.

Motivational conflict within self (CS)- Conflicting and competing motivations within self and contradictory attitudes toward self predominate in this category. The counselor may employ the notion of unconscious motivation here if that construct is a part of his theory of behavior. Such descriptive terms as intrapunative, self-depreciation, anxiety, and depression may suggest this category. The counselor can often infer a considerable gap between the client's perceived self and his ideal self.

Conflict with significant others (CO)- At a sufficiently abstract level it can be successfully argued that conflict with significant others is just a special case of motivational conflict within self. However, on an operational level it seems to be useful to distinguish between CS and CO. Conflict with parents and other authority figures, with roommates, girl friends, or boy friends are common in this category. In addition to the above, conflicts with new sub-cultural groups are included here. Movement from one geographic region to another or from one socioeconomic level to another may produce CO.

Lack of skill (LS)- Clients who lack the necessary skills to meet the demands of their particular situation whether it be educational, social or vocational, are to be diagnosed LS. Poor reading ability, poor study habits, poor social skills and lack of skill in interviewing a prospective employer are typical of clients diagnosed LS. Problems which are primarily motivational in nature are not to be classified as LS.

Journal of Counseling Psychology
Vol. 12, No. 3, 1965
Diagnostic Classification as a Research Tool[1] by Robert Callis

APPENDIX I

SELECTED BACKGROUND DATA FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS BY SEX AND NUMBER OF COUNSELING CONTACTS

SELECTED BACKGROUND DATA FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS BY SEX AND NUMBER OF COUNSELING CONTACTS

Variables	Experimental Group (N=151) No Contact M N=46	No Contact F N=35	Contact M N=37	Contact F N=33	Control Group (N=137) No Contact M N=48	No Contact F N=48	Contact M N=17	Contact F N=24
Age: 16				1	1			1
17	9	15	7	12	14	18	6	9
18	32	20	22	19	22	26	8	14
19	3		8	1	7	4	2	
20+	2				4		1	
Marital Status:								
Single	35	23	26	24	40	39	14	18
Going Steady	8	10	10	7	6	7	2	5
Pinned	3	2	1	2	1	1		1
Engaged					1			
Other						1	1	
Residence:								
Dormitory	32	27	32	29	33	43	15	21
With Parents	13	4	4	3	14	4	1	3
Other	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	
Parents' Status:								
Together	39	24	32	28	41	40	11	21
Divorced	5	5	1	2	2	3	3	1
Father Dead	2	4	4	2	4	4	2	1
Mother Dead		2			1	1		
Other				1			1	1
Rank:								
First Child	15	15	9	10	15	19	2	11
Second Child	19	12	14	13	15	16	8	10
Third Child	6	5	8	6	12	9	4	3
Fourth Child	3	2	2		4	2	2	
Other	3	1	4	4	2	2	1	
Sibs:								
One	19	14	12	10	14	17	3	11
Two	9	7	7	13	12	14	3	6
Three	9	5	3	4	15	5	6	4
Four	3	1	8	1		4	3	1
Five+	6	8	7	5	7	8	2	2
Father's Occupation:								
Craftsman	3	1	5	1	2			2
Office Worker	2	1	2		6	1	2	3
Business	16	12	11	11	13	13	3	5
Social Service	7	5	2	3	5	5	1	2
Executive	8	7	8	6	8	12	5	5
MD, PhD, etc.	6	8	7	9	11	14	3	4
Other	4	1	2	3	3	3	3	3

TABLE CONTINUED

Working Mother:								
No	23	14	18	33	23	25	6	11
Yes	23	21	19	17	25	23	11	13
Mother's Occupation:								
Office Worker	10	12	11	4	10	13	4	4
Business		1	2	1	3	1		3
Social Service	8	3	2	8	5	7		5
Other	5	4	4	4	6	5	4	3
Non-Worker	23	15	18	16	24	22	9	9
Economic Level:								
Below $9,999	7	5	5	3	11	4	3	1
$10-13,999	4	2	8	2	10	4	2	3
$14-19,999	8	4	6	3	10	7	3	6
$20-25,999	9	4	7	9	1	10		2
$26-31,999	3	2	2	1	6	4	1	2
Over $32,000	11	7	6	7	7	10	5	6
Other	4	11	3	8	3	9	3	4
Race:								
White	45	32	35	32	48	47	15	23
Black		2	1	1			1	1
Other	1	1	1			1	1	
Parents' Religious Preference:								
Protestant	20	7	13	10	13	12	6	3
Catholic	16	8	9	4	20	6	1	6
Jewish	7	16	12	17	7	25	6	14
Other	2	1	2	1	4	1	2	
No Religion	1	3	1	1	4	4	2	1
Students' Religious Preference:								
Protestant	12	2	6	6	8	9	5	3
Catholic	10	6	5	4	11	6	1	5
Jewish	6	13	9	15	7	22	3	12
Other	1		2	1	3	2	2	
No Religion	17	14	15	7	19	9	6	4
View of Home:								
Authoritarian	7	3	9	3	6	2	1	4
Permissive	4	3	5	3	4	1	3	1
Cooperative	35	28	22	26	38	43	11	19
Other		1	1	1		2	2	
Discipline:								
Father	30	15	22	12	35	26	10	9
Mother	12	16	12	17	11	17	5	11
Other	4	4	3	4	2	5	2	4

The Total N for the Experimental Group has been reduced by one because the computer mangled a "male-contact" card.

APPENDIX J

TABLES 13 - 29

TABLE 13

SIMPLE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS INCLUDED COMPARING THE FIRST RI WITH THE SECOND RI FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Trial	Variable	Experimental Group M	Experimental Group SD	Control Group M	Control Group SD
1	Level of Regard	29.07	9.99	23.56	12.17
2		25.25	13.66	22.19	16.34
1	Empathic Understanding	24.06	11.15	18.88	15.45
2		18.30	15.34	15.85	16.62
1	Unconditionality of Regard	8.46	13.34	6.34	11.15
2		5.27	13.66	11.32	14.69
1	Congruence	26.39	14.71	20.12	16.22
2		23.35	17.05	18.80	17.99
1	Total	87.99	41.89	68.66	47.42
2		72.06	52.33	68.17	56.10

	Experimental Group DF	SOS	MS	F	Control Group DF	SOS	MS	F
Subjects	70	15150.81	216.44	2.92	40	14014.78	350.37	4.66*
Trials	1	517.19	517.19	6.97	1	38.24	38.24	.51
Error	70	5195.31	74.22	.66	40	3077.76	75.19	.79
Subjects	70	20207.10	288.67	3.80	40	18976.03	474.40	8.90**
Trials	1	1178.03	1178.03	15.48**	1	187.51	187.51	3.52
Error	70	5327.46	76.11	.74	40	2133.49	53.34	.88
Subjects	70	21635.96	309.08	5.10*	40	11786.61	294.66	5.48*
Trials	1	362.88	362.88	5.99*	1	507.51	507.51	9.44**
Error	70	4243.62	60.62	.80	40	2151.48	53.79	.82
Subjects	70	26889.75	384.14	2.96	40	19932.39	498.31	4.83*
Trials	1	328.56	328.56	2.53	1	35.56	35.56	.35
Error	70	9113.44	130.19	.66	40	4128.44	103.21	.79
Subjects	70	256434.00	3663.34	4.10*	40	194766.00	4869.15	7.37*
Trials	1	9008.19	9008.19	10.07**	1	4.94	4.94	.01
Error	70	62632.81	894.75	.76	40	26457.06	661.43	.86

Trial 1 - First RI
Trial 2 - Second RI
M - Mean
SD - Standard Deviation
DF - Degrees of Freedom
SOS - Sum of Squares
MS - Mean Square
F - F-ratio
* - .05 level of confidence
** - .01 level of confidence

TABLE 14

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR THE RI SUBSCALE LEVEL OF REGARD BY GROUPS, SEX, AND TRIALS

		Experimental Group (N-71)		Control Group (N-41)	
Sex	Trial	N	Mean	N	Mean
M	1	38	27.21	17	22.12
	2		25.15		22.47
F	1	33	31.21	24	24.58
	2		25.33		22.00

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	1004.79	1004.79	3.74
Sex	1	120.21	120.21	.45
Group x Sex	1	14.79	14.79	.05
Error (Between)	108	28993.61	268.46	1.00
Trial	1	326.93	326.93	4.40*
Group x Trial	1	102.48	102.48	1.38
Sex x Trial	1	146.67	146.67	1.97
Group x Sex x Trial	1	2.67	2.67	.04
Error (Within)	108	8029.10	74.34	1.00

DF - Degrees of Freedom
F - F-ratio
* - .05 level of confidence

TABLE 15

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR THE RI SUBSCALE EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING BY GROUPS, SEX, AND TRIALS

		Experimental Group (N=71)		Control Group (N=41)	
Sex	Trial	N	Mean	N	Mean
M	1	38	22.42	17	14.18
	2		16.97		13.23
F	1	33	25.94	24	22.21
	2		19.82		17.71

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	1011.05	1011.05	2.87
Sex	1	1132.94	1132.94	3.22
Group x Sex	1	120.06	120.06	.34
Error (Between)	108	38047.54	352.29	1.00
Trial	1	920.80	920.80	13.45**
Group x Trial	1	119.49	119.49	1.74
Sex x Trial	1	57.02	57.02	.83
Group x Sex x Trial	1	26.49	26.49	.39
Error (Within)	108	7393.93	68.46	1.00

TABLE 16

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR THE RI SUBSCALE UNCONDITIONALITY OF REGARD BY GROUPS, SEX, AND TRIALS

		Experimental Group (N=71)		Control Group (N=41)	
Sex	Trial	N	Mean	N	Mean
M	1	38	5.47	17	2.94
	2		3.60		10.00
F	1	33	11.91	24	8.75
	2		7.18		12.25

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	106.00	106.00	.35
Sex	1	1039.26	1039.26	3.48
Group x Sex	1	12.14	12.14	.04
Error (Between)	108	32214.22	298.28	1.00
Trial	1	49.99	49.99	.86
Group x Trial	1	936.54	936.54	16.16**
Sex x Trial	1	131.08	131.08	2.26
Group x Sex x Trial	1	1.56	1.56	.03
Error (Within	108	6259.91	57.96	1.00

DF - Degrees of freedom F - F-ratio ** - .01 level of confidence

TABLE 17

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR THE RI SUBSCALE CONGRUENCE BY GROUPS, SEX AND TRIALS

		Experimental Group (N=71)		Control Group (N=41)	
Sex	Trial	N	Mean	N	Mean
M	1	38	24.34	17	15.70
	2		21.81		19.58
F	1	33	28.76	24	23.25
	2		25.12		18.25

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	1719.24	1719.24	4.03*
Sex	1	617.26	617.26	1.45
Group x Sex	1	7.30	7.30	.02
Error (Between)	108	46104.05	426.89	1.00
Trial	1	168.68	168.68	1.42
Group x Trial	1	81.00	81.00	.68
Sex x Trial	1	317.77	317.77	2.67
Group x Sex x Trial	1	192.25	192.25	1.62
Error (Within)	108	12838.44	118.87	1.00

TABLE 18

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR THE RI TOTAL SCORE BY GROUPS, SEX, AND TRIALS

		Experimental Group (N=71)		Control Group (N=41)	
Sex	Trial	N	Mean	N	Mean
M	1	38	79.45	17	54.35
	2		67.63		65.29
F	1	33	97.81	24	78.79
	2		77.15		70.20

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	9075.64	9075.64	2.23
Sex	1	10428.55	10428.55	2.56
Group x Sex	1	6.80	6.80	.00
Error (Between)	108	440043.81	4074.48	1.00
Trial	1	2888.10	2888.10	3.61
Group x Trial	1	3863.07	3863.07	4.82*
Sex x Trial	1	2562.43	2562.43	3.19
Group x Sex x Trial	1	362.57	362.57	.45
Error (Within)	108	86500.91	800.93	1.00

DF - Degrees of freedom
F - F-ratio
* - .05 level of confidence

TABLE 19

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR THE RI SUBSCALE LEVEL OF REGARD BY GROUPS, NUMBER OF CONTACTS, AND TRIALS

	Experimental Group (N-71)			Control Group (N-41)		
Contacts	N	M1	M2	N	M1	M2
1	35	28.06	20.63	20	23.40	20.55
2	14	31.78	31.64	11	24.09	17.82
3	10	26.10	22.40	4	20.25	24.25
4-5	7	28.86	29.43	3	26.33	33.33
6	5	34.80	39.60	3	24.33	35.33

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	594.10	594.10	2.32
Contacts	4	1944.60	486.15	1.90
Group x Contacts	4	531.37	132.84	.52
Error (Between)	102	26099.15	255.87	1.00
Trial	1	15.21	15.21	.22
Group x Trial	1	110.15	110.15	1.59
Contact x Trial	4	693.76	173.44	2.50
Group x Contacts x Trial	4	198.50	49.63	.71
Error (Within)	102	7080.81	69.42	1.00

M1 - Mean for First RI
M2 - Mean for Second RI
DF - Degrees of freedom
F - F-ratio

TABLE 20

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR THE RI SUBSCALE EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING BY GROUPS, NUMBER OF CONTACTS, AND TRIALS

	Experimental Group (N=71)			Control Group (N=41)		
Contacts	N	M1	M2	N	M1	M2
1	35	22.17	14.06	20	14.35	11.95
2	14	27.36	23.07	11	20.82	13.18
3	10	23.20	15.50	4	21.50	19.75
4-5	7	24.71	23.71	3	25.00	26.67
6+	5	28.80	32.60	3	32.33	35.67

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	60.96	60.96	.18
Contacts	4	3956.43	989.11	2.96
Group x Contacts	4	609.20	152.30	.46
Error (Between)	102	34078.11	334.10	1.00
Trial	1	181.25	181.25	2.71
Group x Trial	1	34.53	34.53	.52
Contact x Trial	4	433.14	108.29	1.62
Group x Contacts x Trial	4	100.76	25.19	.38
Error (Within)	102	6804.36	66.71	1.00

TABLE 21

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR THE RI SUBSCALE UNCONDITIONALITY OF REGARD BY GROUPS, NUMBER OF CONTACTS, AND TRIALS

	Experimental Group (N=71)			Control Group (N=41)		
Contacts	N	M1	M2	N	M1	M2
1	35	7.43	2.88	20	2.00	9.15
2	14	11.71	6.78	11	11.64	9.27
3	10	4.80	4.00	4	6.00	13.25
4-5	7	13.43	11.00	3	6.67	13.00
6+	5	7.00	12.20	3	16.00	29.00

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	376.89	376.89	1.25
Contacts	4	1698.90	424.72	1.40
Group x Contacts	4	879.05	219.76	.73
Error (Between)	102	30848.02	302.43	1.00
Trial	1	178.00	178.00	3.19
Group x Trial	1	472.01	472.01	8.47*
Contact x Trial	4	521.91	130.47	2.34
Group x Contact x Trial	4	68.02	17.00	0.30
Error (Within)	102	5682.12	55.71	1.00

M1 - Mean for first RI
M2 - Mean for second RI
DF - Degrees of freedom
F - F-ratio
* - .05 level of confidence

TABLE 22

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR THE RI SUBSCALE CONGRUENCE BY GROUPS, NUMBER OF CONTACTS, AND TRIALS

	Experimental Group (N=71)			Control Group (N=41)		
Contacts	N	M1	M2	N	M1	M2
1	35	24.71	18.94	20	17.20	16.45
2	14	30.50	28.14	11	21.73	15.82
3	10	25.20	15.70	4	13.50	15.75
4-5	7	22.57	34.86	3	32.67	32.33
6+	5	34.40	40.00	3	30.00	36.00

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	593.43	593.43	1.48
Contacts	4	5541.21	1385.30	3.45
Group x Contacts	4	670.06	167.51	.42
Error (Between)	102	40906.47	401.04	1.00
Trial	1	.71	.71	.00
Group x Trial	1	.31	.31	.00
Contact x Trial	4	687.91	171.98	1.50
Group x Contacts x Trial	4	523.44	130.86	1.14
Error (Within)	102	11664.29	114.356	1.00

TABLE 23

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR THE RI TOTAL SCORE BY GROUPS, NUMBER OF CONTACTS, AND TRIALS

	Experimental Group (N=71)			Control Group (N=41)		
Contacts	N	M1	M2	N	M1	M2
1	35	82.37	56.80	20	56.95	58.10
2	14	101.36	89.50	11	77.36	56.09
3	10	79.30	56.60	4	61.25	73.00
4-5	7	89.57	98.14	3	90.66	105.33
6+	5	105.00	124.00	3	102.67	136.00

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	1345.32	1345.32	.35
Contacts	4	48104.29	12026.07	3.12
Group x Contacts	4	4956.33	1239.08	.32
Error (Between)	102	393682.65	3859.63	1.00
Trial	1	17.43	17.43	.02
Group x Trial	1	1609.88	1609.88	2.13
Contact x Trial	4	8003.38	2000.84	2.64
Group x Contact x Trial	4	1859.15	464.78	.61
Error (Within)	102	77133.06	756.21	1.00

M1 - Mean for first RI
M2 - Mean for second RI
DF - Degrees of freedom
F - F-ratio

TABLE 24

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR THE RI SUBSCALE LEVEL OF REGARD BY GROUPS, COUNSELORS, AND TRIALS

	Experimental Group (N-71)			Control Group (N-41)		
Counselor	N	M1	M2	N	M1	M2
1	24	29.08	23.54	11	22.00	23.27
2	11	28.00	29.81	5	28.60	30.40
3	15	30.40	24.33	5	24.00	15.60
4	11	30.64	22.18	16	19.37	17.56
5	10	26.50	29.10	4	37.75	35.75

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	155.79	155.79	.60
Counselor	4	2336.29	584.07	2.26
Counselor x Group	4	1639.42	409.85	1.58
Error (Between)	102	26345.77	259.29	1.00
Trial	1	257.33	257.33	3.53
Group x Trial	1	17.73	17.73	.24
Counselor x Trial	4	468.17	117.04	1.60
Group x Counselor X Trial	4	227.66	56.92	.78
Error (Within)	102	7441.14	72.95	1.00

M1 - Mean for first RI
M2 - Mean for secong RI
DF - Degrees of freedom
F - F-ratio

TABLE 25

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR THE RI SUBSCALE EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING BY GROUPS, COUNSELORS AND TRIALS

	Experimental Group (N=71)			Control Group (N=41)		
Counselor	N	M1	M2	N	M1	M2
1	24	24.04	14.83	11	16.64	14.54
2	11	23.00	21.18	5	28.00	27.60
3	15	25.53	18.07	5	25.20	14.60
4	11	23.54	14.36	16	11.94	9.69
5	10	23.60	28.10	4	33.50	31.00

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	5.31	5.31	.02
Counselor	4	4321.43	1080.36	3.23
Counselor x Group	4	1320.58	330.15	.98
Error (Between)	102	34093.63	334.25	1.00
Trial	1	704.74	704.74	11.15*
Group x Trial	1	11.92	11.92	.19
Counselor x Trial	4	538.77	134.69	2.13
Group x Counselor x Trial	4	322.24	80.56	1.27
Error (Within)	102	6449.39	63.23	1.00

TABLE 26

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR THE RI SUBSCALE UNCONDITIONALITY OF REGARD BY GROUPS, COUNSELORS AND TRIALS

	Experimental Group (N=71)			Control Group (N=41)		
Counselor	N	M1	M2	N	M1	M2
1	24	9.62	.95	11	5.00	9.00
2	11	3.82	6.18	5	11.40	18.00
3	15	11.93	8.53	5	4.80	8.40
4	11	10.00	7.00	16	6.31	11.56
5	10	3.90	7.80	4	5.75	12.00

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	211.60	211.60	.66
Counselor	4	265.03	66.26	.21
Group x Counselor	4	790.03	197.51	.63
Error (Between)	102	32339.08	317.05	1.00
Trial	1	119.60	119.60	2.18
Group x Trial	1	498.70	498.70	9.09*
Counselor x Trial	4	320.78	80.19	1.46
Group x Counselor x Trial	4	131.71	32.92	.60
Error (Within)	102	5593.26	54.84	1.00

M1 - Mean for first RI
M2 - Mean for second RI
DF - Degrees of Freedom
F - F-ratio
* - .05 level of confidence

TABLE 27

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR THE RI SUBSCALE CONGRUENCE BY GROUPS, COUNSELORS, AND TRIALS

	Experimental Group (N=71)			Control Group (N=41)		
Counselor	N	M1	M2	N	M1	M2
1	24	25.00	20.20	11	19.64	17.00
2	11	29.09	25.18	5	29.60	28.40
3	15	26.93	19.67	5	25.80	12.00
4	11	24.82	23.73	16	12.37	15.12
5	10	27.70	33.30	4	33.50	35.00

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	316.38	316.28	.77
Counselor	4	4415.79	1103.95	2.68
Group x Counselor	4	1085.00	271.25	.66
Error (Between)	102	42042.43	412.18	1.00
Trial	1	252.54	252.54	2.12
Group x Trial	1	2.06	2.06	.02
Counselor x Trial	4	949.74	237.44	1.99
Group x Counselor x Trial	4	176.09	44.02	.37
Error (Within)	102	12136.65	118.99	1.00

TABLE 28

FOUR WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS INCLUDED FOR THE RI TOTAL SCORE BY GROUPS, COUNSELORS, AND TRIALS

	Experimental Group (N=71)			Control Group (N=41)		
Counselor	N	M1	M2	N	M1	M2
1	24	87.75	60.00	11	63.27	63.82
2	11	83.91	82.36	5	95.60	104.40
3	15	94.80	70.47	5	79.80	50.60
4	11	89.00	67.27	16	50.00	53.94
5	10	81.70	97.30	4	110.50	113.75

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Group	1	349.49	349.49	.09
Counselor	4	32000.86	8000.22	1.98
Group x Counselor	4	15499.20	3874.80	.96
Error (Between)	102	412552.80	4044.63	1.00
Trial	1	2197.25	2197.25	2.87
Group x Trial	1	928.89	928.89	1.21
Counselor x Trial	4	6872.94	1718.24	2.24
Group x Counselor x Trial	4	2721.00	680.25	.88
Error (Within)	102	78122.58	765.91	1.00

M1 - Mean for first RI
M2 - Mean for Second RI
DF - Degrees of Freedom
F - F-ratio

TABLE 29

TWO WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS INCLUDED FOR RI BY GROUPS AND TRIALS FOR DISMISSALS

Trial	Variable	Experimental Group (N-13) M	Experimental Group (N-13) SD	Control Group (N-6) M	Control Group (N-6) SD
1	Level of Regard	29.30	9.63	23.17	11.61
2		24.69	11.58	20.33	14.39
1	Empathic Understanding	25.85	9.10	24.83	13.75
2		18.77	10.87	17.33	13.86
1	Unconditionality of Regard	11.54	9.67	11.33	5.71
2		2.54	13.60	15.33	10.51
1	Congruence	27.59	10.18	25.33	15.29
2		22.46	16.40	20.17	14.03
1	Total	93.85	32.00	84.67	43.60
2		67.69	44.93	73.17	47.89

	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Trials	1	156.03	156.03	1.80
Groups	1	226.30	226.30	1.09
Subjects	17	3531.75	207.75	2.40
Group x Trial	1	6.51	6.51	.08
Error	17	1469.96	86.47	
Trials	1	493.92	493.92	5.24*
Groups	1	12.31	12.31	.06
Subjects	17	3300.96	194.17	2.06
Group x Trial	1	.37	.37	.00
Error	17	1601.21	94.19	
Trials	1	203.79	203.79	2.85
Groups	1	345.53	345.53	1.80
Subjects	17	3264.05	192.00	2.69
Group x Trial	1	326.67	326.67	4.58*
Error	17	1213.54	71.38	
Trials	1	247.60	247.60	1.48
Groups	1	41.57	41.57	.15
Subjects	17	4582.75	269.57	1.61
Group x Trial	1	.01	.01	.00
Error	17	2845.88	167.40	
Trials	1	4402.12	4402.12	3.60
Groups	1	28.19	28.19	.01
Subjects	17	43944.06	2584.94	2.11
Group x Trial	1	440.75	440.75	.36
Error	17	20782.62	1222.51	

Trial 1 - First RI
Trial 2 - Second RI
M - Mean
SD - Standard Deviation
DF - Degrees of Freedom
F - F-ratio
* - .05 level of confidence

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Personnel and Guidance Association. "The Counselor: Professional Preparation and Role; A Statement of Policy." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLII (January, 1964), 536-541.

Amundson, Bea J. and Rosenblum, Frieda T. "The Classroom Teacher Perceives the Counselor." The School Counselor, XV (January, 1968), 215-219.

Anastasi, Anne. Psychological Testing. New York: MacMillan Co., 1961.

Arbuckle, Dugald, S. "A Question of Counselor Function and Responsibility." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVII (December, 1968), 341-345.

_____. "Can English Teachers Be Counselors?" English Journal, XLII (April, 1953), 192-193.

_____. "Current Issues in Counselor Education." Counselor Education and Supervision, VII (Spring, 1968), 244-251.

_____. Pupil Personnel Services in the Modern School. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966.

_____. Teacher Counseling. Cambridge, Mass. : Addison-Wesley Press, Inc., 1950.

_____. "The School Counselor -- Reality or Illusion." Counselor Education and Supervision, II (Winter, 1963), 54-65.

Barrett-Lennard, G.T. "Dimensions of Perceived Therapist Responses Related to Therapeutic Change." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1959.

_____. "Dimensions of Therapist Response as Causal Factors in Therapeutic Change." Psychological Monographs, LXXVI No.43, whole no. 562, 1962.

_____. and Jewell, Linda M. "A Selection of Reported Studies, Using the Relationship Inventory." Unpublished paper, University of Southern Illinois, May, 1966, (Mimeographed).

Bentley, Joseph C. "Role Theory in Counseling: A Problem in Definition." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIV (September, 1965), 11-16.

Berdie, Ralph F. "Student Personnel Work: Definition and Redefinition." Journal of College Student Personnel, VII (May, 1966), 131-136.

Berezin, Annabel G. "The Development and Use of a System of Diagnostic Categories in Counseling." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1957.

Bock, R. D. "Programing Univariate and Multivariate Analysis of Variance." Technometrics, V (1963), 95-117.

Borden, E.S. "Diagnosis in Counseling and Psychotherapy." Educational and Psychological Measurement, VI (1946), 169-184.

Brown, Duane and Peterson, Bettie H. "The Teaching Experience Prerequisite for the School Counselor: An Examination." The School Counselor, XVI (September, 1968), 17-20.

Cady, Lillian V. "Developmental Guidance - One Definition and Rationale." The School Counselor, XVI (January, 1969), 218-222.

Callis, Robert. "Diagnostic Classification as a Research Tool." Journal of Counseling Psychology, XII (Spring, 1965), 238-243.

Clare, Mary Julia. "Teacher-Counselor in the Small High School." Catholic School Journal, (October, 1963), 45-46.

Cottingham, Harold F. "Implementing Two Vital Teacher Functions: Guidance and Instruction." Counselor Education and Supervision, I(Spring, 1962), 166-169.

_____, and Lifton, Walter M. "The Role of the Teacher and the Instructor in the Guidance Program." Review of Educational Research, XXVII (April, 1957), 192-201.

Dannenmaier, William D. "A Survey of Effects Arising from Differential Practices in Employment of School Counselors." The School Counselor, XIII (October, 1965), 25-29.

Doi, Edith; Hyman, Bernard; and Young, Earl. "A Survey of Colorado Counselors." Counselor Education and Supervision, II(Fall, 1962), 14-16.

Donk, Leonard J. and Oetting, Eugene R. "Student-Faculty Relations and the Faculty Advising System." Journal of College Student Personnel, IX (November, 1968), 400-403.

Donnan, Hugh H. and Harlan, Grady. "Personality of Counselors and Administrators." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVII (November, 1968), 228-232.

Dunlop, Richard S. "Counseling As A Profession: Toward Occupational Maturity." Focus on Guidance, II (September, 1969), 1-12.

Dunsmoor, C.C. "Counselor - or What?" Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (October, 1964), 135-138.

Educational Testing Service. College Student Questionnaire. Princeton, New Jersey: 1965.

Edwards, Allen L. Manual: Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. New York: The Psychological Association, 1959.

Escott, Stanley B. "The Counselor-Teacher Relationship." The School Counselor, XI (May, 1964), 215-220.

Farwell, Gail F. "Counselors Themselves -- an Issue." The School Counselor, X (October, 1962), 27-31.

_____, and Peters, Herman J. "The Guidance Functions of the Classroom Teacher." Clearing House, XXX (December, 1955), 231-233.

Filbeck, Robert W. "Perceptions of Appropriateness of Counselor Behavior: A Comparison of Counselors and Principals." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (May, 1965), 891-896.

Fiske, Donald W. "Review of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule." The Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook. Edited by Oscar K. Buros. Highland Park, N.J.: The Gryphon Press, 1959.

Foster, Charles R. Guidance for Today's Schools. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1957.

Fotiu, Peter G. "Do Counselors and Principals Agree?" The School Counselor, XIV (May, 1967), 298-303.

Freud, Anna. Psycho-Analysis for Teachers and Parents. New York: Emerson Books, 1935.

Friedland, Stanley H. "Teacher-Counselor Friction: An Analysis." The School Counselor, XVI (March, 1969), 263-267.

Gibson, Robert L. "Pupil Opinions of High School Guidance Programs." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (January, 1962), 453-457.

_____. "Teacher Opinions of High School Guidance Programs." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIV (December, 1965), 416-422.

Gilbert, Norman S. "A Comparison of Students' Perceptions of Counseling Relationships Among Schools in Which Counselor Duties Differ." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1962. Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII (March, 1963), 4257, No. 63-3250.

Gilmore, John V. "A New Venture in the Testing of Motivation." The College Board Review, XV (November, 1951), 221-226.

_____. Gilmore Sentence Completion Test. Boston: By the Author, 1953.

Glanz, Edward C. "Emerging Concepts and Patterns of Guidance in American Education." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (November, 1961), 259-265.

Goertzen, Stan M. and Strong, Donald J. "Counseling Practices in the Small Colleges and Universities of the Pacific Northwest: A Twelve-Year Follow-up Study." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (November, 1962), 254-259.

Gordan, Ira J. The Teacher as a Guidance Worker. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1956.

Grant, Claude W. "The Teacher-Student Relationship Is Not Counseling." Journal of Counseling Psychology, VII (Spring, 1960), 148-149.

Greenleaf, Elizabeth A. "How Others See Us." Journal of College Student Personnel, IX (July, 1968), 225-231.

Hanson, Eleanor B. "Middle-Class Parents Look at the Role and Function of the Counselor." The School Counselor, XVI (November, 1968), 115-119.

Harrold, William S. and LeMay, Morris L. "The Counselor Disciplinarian in the Junior High." The School Counselor, XV (March, 1968), 281-283.

Heilfron, Marilyn. "Changing Students' Perceptions of the Counselor's Role." The School Counselor, XI (May, 1964), 221-225.

Hill, George E. "How to Define the Functions of the School Counselor?" Counselor Education and Supervision, III (Winter, 1964), 56-62.

Hollis, Joseph and Isaacson, Lee. "How School Counselors Spend Their Time." The School Counselor, IX (March, 1962), 89-95.

Hoyt, Kenneth B. "Guidance: A Constellation of Services." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (April, 1962), 690-697.

_____. "What the School Has a Right to Expect of Its Counselor." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (October, 1961), 129-132.

Hudson, George R. "Counselors Need Teaching Experience." Counselor Education and Supervision, I (Fall, 1961), 24-27.

Hurlbut, Edward V. "Adult Teachers Are Counselors." Adult Leadership, X (March, 1962), 263-264.

Hutson, P.W. "Foundations of the Curriculum for the Education of Homeroom Teachers." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (April, 1962), 698-702.

Isaksen, Henry L. "Emerging Models of Secondary School Counseling as Viewed from the Context of Practice." The School Counselor, XIV (May, 1967), 273-280.

Ivey, Allan E. "A Study of Two Types of Guidance Staff Organization and Their Relation to Student Perception and Use of College Guidance Services." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University School of Education, 1959.

Johnson, Victor B. "Implications of the Wrenn Report for State Supervision." Counselor Education and Supervision, II (Fall, 1962), 27-34.

Johnston, Joseph A. and Walz, Garry R. "Approaching Counselor Role Through Q-Sort Method." The School Counselor, XV (September, 1967), 39-44.

Jones, Arthur J. Principles of Guidance and Pupil Personnel Work. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1951.

Kiernan, Irene R. "The Clinician as a College Teacher." The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLII (June, 1964), 970-975.

Knapp, Dale and Denny, Earl W. "The Counselor's Responsibility in Role Definition." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (September, 1961), 48-50.

Landy, Edward. "Who Does What in the Guidance Program?" The School Counselor, X (March, 1963), 112-118.

Larson, William R. and Rice, Roger E. "The Differential Perception of the School Counselor by Deviant and Non-Deviant Students." The School Counselor, XV (September, 1967), 26-31.

Lifton, Walter F. "Current Problems Facing the School Counseling Movement." Counselor Education and Supervision , (Fall, 1961), 31-35.

Little, Donald and Walker, Basil S. "Tutor-Pupil Relationship and Academic Progress." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVII (December, 1968), 324-328.

Lloyd, David O. "Counselor and Counselor Trainer Attitudes Toward Counselor Certification in the United States." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (May, 1962), 791-798.

Lortie, Dan C. "Administrator, Advocate, or Therapist?" Harvard Educational Review, XXXV (Winter, 1965), 3-17.

Lynch, Margaret A. "Use of the Gilmore Sentence Completion Test As a Predictive Instrument in Relation to the Academic Achievement of Certain High School Students." Unpublished Masters thesis, Boston University School of Education, Boston, Massachusetts, 1960.

Lytton, Hugh. "School Counseling - An Outside View." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVII (September, 1968), 12-17.

McCully, C. Harold. "The School Counselor: Strategy for Professionalization." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (April, 1962), 681-689.

McDaniel, Henry B. with Shaftel, G.A. Guidance in the Modern School. New York: The Dryden Press, 1956.

McDougall, William P. and Reitan, Henry M. "The Elementary Counselor as Perceived by Elementary Principals." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLII (December, 1963), 348-354.

Mamminga,Arthur F., Jr. "Junior and Senior High Teachers Must Be Counselors." Clearing House, XVII (April, 1943), 477-480.

Melton, Culbeth. "The Helping Relationship in College Reading Clinics." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (May, 1965), 925-928.

Mills, D.H. and Zytowski, D.G. "Helping Relationships: A Structural Analysis." Journal of Counseling Psychology, XLIV (April, 1967), 193-197.

Moore, Gilbert D. and Cramer, Stanley H. "Toward More Effective Use of Counselor Time." The School Counselor, XVI (March, 1969), 260-262.

Morehead, Charles G. and Johnson, J. Clyde. "Some Effects of a Faculty Advising Program." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (October, 1964), 139-144.

Noble, Frank C. "Why Don't Counselors Counsel?" The School Counselor, XVI (November, 1968), 94-98.

Nugent, Frank A. "A Framework for Appropriate Referrals of Disciplinary Problems of Counselors." The School Counselor, XVI (January, 1969), 199-201.

_____. "A Rationale Against Teaching Experience for School Counselors." The School Counselor, XIII (May, 1966), 213-215.

Odle, S. Gene and Cambareri, John D. "Staffing for Clinical Counseling Services in the Small College." The Journal of College Student Personnel, VII (July, 1966), 233-235.

Ohlsen, Merle M. Guidance an Introduction. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1955.

Patterson, Cecil H. Counseling and Guidance in Schools: A First Course. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

_____. "The Counselor in the Elementary School." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVII (June, 1969), 979-986.

_____. The School Counselor in the School: Selected Readings. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1967.

Pepinsky, H.G. "The Selection and Use of Diagnostic Categories in Clinical Counseling." Psychological Monographs, No. 15, 1948.

Perrone, Philip A.; Weiking, Mary L.; and Nagel, Elwyn H. "The Counseling Function as Seen by Students, Parents and Teachers." Journal of Counseling Psychology, XII (Summer, 1965), 148-152.

Peters, Herman J. "The Nature of the Guidance Function." Counselor Education and Supervision, III (Spring, 1964), 122-128.

_____. "The School Counselor's Emerging Responsibilities." The School Counselor, IX (May, 1962), 134-139.

_____, and Farwell, Gail F. Guidance: A Developmental Approach. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1959.

Peterson, Richard E. Technical Manual: College Student Questionnaires. Princton, New Jersey.

Pierson, George A., and Grant, Claude W. "The Road Ahead for the School Counselor." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVIII (November, 1959), 207-210.

Privette, Gayle, and Merrill, Charles H. "A Humanistic and Experiential Approach to Personal Development." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLV (November, 1966), 267-271.

Radcliffe, John A. "Review of the Edwards Personality Schedule." The Sixth Mental Measurement Yearbook. Edited by Oscar K. Buros. Highland Park, N.J.: The Gryphon Press, 1965.

Reeves, Mary Elizabeth and Arbuckle, Dugald S. "The 'Counseling' Attitudes of Deans of Women." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (January, 1963), 438-441.

Ribbeck, James C. "Don't Forget the Classroom Teacher!" The School Counselor, XII (December, 1964), 98-100.

Richardson, R.G., Jr., "Developing Student Personnel Programs in Newly Established Junior Colleges." The Journal of College Student Personnel, VI (September, 1965), 295-299.

Roemmich, Herman. "Counselor Functions in Terms of Behavioral Tasks." The School Counselor, XIV (May, 1967), 312-317.

Rogers, Carl R. Counseling and Psychotherapy. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1942.

Rossman, Jack E. "An Experimental Study of Faculty Advising." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVI (October, 1967), 160-164.

Sappenfield, Bert R. Personality Dynamics. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956.

Schmidt, Lyle D. "Concepts of the Role of Secondary School Counselors." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (March, 1962), 600-605.

Sheran, Robert and Shapiro, Ida. "Teacher-Counselor Communications." The School Counselor, XVII (September, 1969), 55-62.

Shertzer, Bruce and Lundy, Charles T. "Administrators' Image of an Elementary School Counselor." The School Counselor, XI (May, 1964), 211-214.

Shertzer, Bruce and Stone, Shelley C. "The School Counselor and His Publics: A Problem in Role Definition." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (April, 1963), 687-693.

Shostrom, Everett L. Personal Orientation Inventory. San Francisco: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1963.

Silverberg, William V. Childhood Experience and Personal Destiny. New York: Springer Publishing Co., Inc., 1952.

Siniapkin, Serge N. "A Comparison Between Academic Success and Responses on a Sentence Completion Test." Unpublished Masters thesis, Boston University School of Education, Boston, Massachusetts, 1958.

Smith, Geraldine E. "The Relationship Between the Responses on the GSCT, with the First Semester Grades of 302 Nursing Students." Unpublished Masters thesis, Boston University School of Nursing, Boston, Massachusetts, 1956.

Smith, Glenn E. "The Teacher's Role in Guidance." National Association of Secondary-School Principals Bulletin, XXVII (February, 1943), 84-88.

Smith, Maurice R. "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Counselor Role-Function and Counselee Perception of Help Received." (Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966), Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII (November, 1966), 1241-A, No. 66 - 11,590.

Sorenson, Garth. "Pterodactyls, Passenger Pigeons, and Personnel Workers." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII(January, 1965), 430-437.

Stefflre, Buford. "What Price Professionalization?" Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLII (March, 1964), 654-659.

_____, and Leafgren, Fred. "Value Differences Between Counselors and Administrators." The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, X (Summer, 1962), 226-228.

Stewart, C.C. "A Bill of Rights for School Counselors." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVII (March, 1959), 500-503.

Stieper, Donald R. and Wiener, Daniel N. Dimensions of Psychotherapy: an Experimental and Clinical Approach. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965.

Stiller, Alfred and Gannon, Frederick B. "Differential Perceptions of Counselor Role: Implications for Program Modification." The School Counselor, XV (January, 1968), 198-202.

Stone, Shelley C. and Shertzer, Bruce. "The Militant Counselor." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLII (December, 1963), 342-347.

Strang, Ruth M. "The Relation of Guidance to the Teaching of Reading." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIV (April, 1966), 831-836.

_____. The Role of the Teacher in Personnel Work. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1946.

_____. The Role of the Teacher in Personnel Work. Second Edition Revised, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955.

Strowig, R. Wray. ". . .And Gladly Teach (That I May Counsel)." Newsletter, Illinois Guidance Personnel Association, (Winter, 1961), 33-38.

Sweeney, Thomas J. "The School Counselor as Perceived by School Counselors and Their Principals." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIV (April, 1966) 844-849.

Taylor, Robert E. "How Does the Counselor's Chair Fit." The School Counselor, XVI (January, 1969), 210-215.

Tribou, Virginia. "A Study of the G.S.C.T. in Relation to Academic Achievement in a Private Liberal Arts College." Unpublished Masters thesis, Boston University School of Education, Boston Massachusetts, 1958.

Ullman, J. Leonard. "Opportunities for Counseling in the High School Art Department." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLII (February, 1964), 610-611.

Venn, Kenneth C. "Should We Condemn Current Guidance Practices? A Practitioner's Evaluation." Counselor Education and Supervision, III (Spring, 1964), 158-161.

Weeks, James S.; Sander, Daryle L.; and Miller, C. Dean. "The Unique Educational Functions of the School Counselor." The School Counselor, XIII (March, 1966), 134-145.

Whetstone, Bobby D. "Personality Differences Between Selected Counselors and Effective Teachers." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (May, 1965), 886-890.

Wilde, Charles F. "Every Teacher an Advising Specialist." Clearing House, XXVI (November, 1951), 143-145.

Williamson, E.G. "Counselor as Technique." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (October, 1962) 108-111.

_____. "The Fusion of Discipline and Counseling in the Educative Process." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXIV (October, 1955), 74-79.

_____. and Darley, J.G. Student Personnel Work. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1937.

Wrenn, C. Gilbert. "Guidance in Other Countries -- A Symposium 'Counseling' in British Universities." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (November, 1961), 266-270.